

VOLUME 8

NUMBER 12.

PRICE 1/-

# Christian Order

## Summary of Contents for December, 1967

COMPETITION AND THE WORKER

*The Editor*

CATCHING UP WITH THE CHURCH *Sr Teresa Margaret DC*

PROPERTY AND ECONOMIC POWER

*J. M. Jackson*

MONKS AND MISSIONS

*Gerard Rathe, W.F.*

PEACE ON EARTH

*Paul Crane, S.J.*

CONFETTI AND DRY ROT

*E. L. Way*

# Contents

Page

705 THANK YOU AND PLEASE NOTE

*The Editor*

707 CATCHING UP WITH THE CHURCH

*Sr. Teresa Margaret, DC.*

717 THE UNPRODIGAL SON

*Vincent Rochford*

721 THE SOCIALIST DILEMMA

*The Editor*

727 CONFETTI AND DRY ROT

*E. L. Way*

733 MONKS AND MISSIONS

*Gerard Rathe, W.F.*

742 WHAT KIND OF ECONOMIC SYSTEM ?

*J. M. Jackson*

749 ANY QUESTIONS ?

*William Lawson, S.J.*

756 VATICAN COUNCIL II

*Observer*

763 BOOK REVIEWS

## If You Change Your Address:

If you are planning to change your address please let us know at least two or three weeks ahead because subscription lists are made up in advance. Send us both new and old addresses.

**CHRISTIAN ORDER** is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs. It is published for Father Paul Crane, S.J., 65 Belgrave Road, London SW1, by C. J. Fallon (London) Ltd., 1 Furnival St., London EC4 and 31 King St., Belfast 1, and printed in the Republic of Ireland by Lithographic Universal Ltd., Bray.

Annual subscription : one year, fifteen shillings; in the U.S.A. and Canada, three dollars; in Australia twenty-one shillings; postage paid.

Those who previously bought Christian Order each month at their church door or elsewhere are advised that the magazine is obtainable by subscription only. The rate is 15/- per annum. Send your subscription please to:

**C. J. Fallon Ltd.,  
43 Parkgate Street,  
Dublin 8, Ireland.**

# Christian Order

EDITED BY  
Paul Crane SJ

---

VOL. 8

DECEMBER, 1967

NUMBER 12

---

## Thank You and Please Note

THE EDITOR

AS most readers probably know, *Christian Order* is sold by subscription only. There are no sales copies. The reason for this is comparatively simple. I am without the time and financial resources which would be needed to build up the kind of distributive machinery necessary to market *Christian Order* on a sales basis. Even if I had the time and the money, I am not so sure that I would want to use either in this fashion. Past experience has taught me that circulation figures based on sales copies often present a false picture. So many copies are not sold. In many cases, they are taken and paid for by good people who give unsold copies away or junk them. I am not sure that this does any real good to anyone.

With subscriptions, on the other hand, you know where you are. Moreover, you are called on to extend no credit. Neither have you to write weary letters asking good and faithful sellers to pay debts accumulated on copies taken out of generous loyalty to the cause and then, for any of several reasons, left unsold. I used to hate writing these letters in the past, for it seemed such base ingratitude to those whose faithfulness and generosity I valued so much. But the letters had to be written and the money recovered, for how else was I to pay my printers? In the end it became too much all round. Three or four years ago, therefore, I confined the circulation of *Christian Order* to a subscription basis. It got rid of the stress and the strain that sales circulation tends to bring. It meant

that I knew where I stood. Those who read the Review thought sufficiently highly of it to subscribe to it. I knew I had their interest. They were abundantly well worth writing for.

So it has proved in practice. I am happy to say that the number of those who subscribe to *Christian Order* stands at 2,200, which is reckoned to be very good. Its readers are spread right round the world. Of their interest and appreciation there can be no doubt. I would like to take this opportunity of thanking them with all my heart for their unfailing support.

I am quite sure it will continue even though I have to make known now that, as from January, 1968, the annual subscription to *Christian Order* has got to be raised from 15s. to 20s. Since the publication of the first number of the Review in January, 1960, I have managed to hold the annual subscription at 15s. I can no longer do this in the face of rising costs. I think you will agree that the adjustment is reasonable. What this means, so far as readers are concerned, is that, when they next renew, they should send £1 instead of 15s. There are no other complications. So, just wait for your renewal notice and, then, whether it comes this month or in six months time, be so kind, please, as to send £1 as promptly as you can.

In past years, I have made a practice of asking readers of *Christian Order* to help the work forward at Christmas time by taking out a subscription to *Christian Order* on behalf of a friend. You have been most generous in this respect in past years. Please be generous again this year by filling in the form enclosed with this December issue of *Christian Order* and returning it to me along with a subscription for a friend. Your friend will be informed that *Christian Order* comes as a gift from yourself. If you cannot think of anyone to whom to send the Review, please remember that I can. If you send a subscription to *Christian Order* with the request that it be sent to someone likely to appreciate it, I will be only too happy to oblige.

I would like to thank you once again for all your unfailing support during this past year and to wish you all a most blessed Christmas.

Nuns are really the only ones fully qualified to understand and settle the conditions most likely to foster the feminine contemplative life in the twentieth century, but at present they have neither a general chapter of their own, nor authority to alter existing legislation, being subject to that of the first (or male) order. . . Without lowering the standards of prayer and asceticism, the enclosed orders need to reconsider their relationship to the world from every angle.

## Catching up with the Church

SR. TERESA MARGARET DC

*Prefectae Caritatis*, the Vatican II Decree on the Renewal of Religious Life, says:

"Members of those communities which are totally dedicated to contemplation\* give themselves to God alone in solitude and silence and through constant prayer and ready penance. . . . Nevertheless, their manner of living should be revised according to the standards of appropriate renewal, though their withdrawal from the world and the practice of their contemplative life should be maintained at their holiest" (S.7).

It is nearly two years since the final session at which the above was promulgated, and many people wonder when, if ever, they will see indications of the "appropriate renewal" of a manner of living which to them appears out of step with modern conditions of Church, world and the apostolate.

### *Separation from the World*

Fairly radical adaptation of legislation governing enclosure for

\* A footnote identifies these as Carthusians, Trappists and Discalced Carmelites.

women is urgently needed, and it must cut deeper than merely abolishing the medieval externals or walls, bolted doors and barred grilles. The canonical legislation at present in force is hopelessly outmoded; that fact daily becomes more apparent. The reasons for modification are legion, and they demonstrate that in a milieu characterized by universal solidarity, and a Church aware of her spiritual responsibility, these external signs of separation and forcible incarceration (to say nothing of the gravity of the sanctions for violating this anachronistic law: *ipso facto* excommunication, which is out of all proportion to the nature of the offence) contradict the very reason and meaning of the contemplative life. As long as the limits of the cloister are clearly defined, they can just as well be indicated by a chalk line on the floor.

The enclosed orders need to reconsider their relationship to present day society from every angle, without in any way weakening or lowering the standard of prayer and asceticism, which is their *raison d'être* and principal contribution to the People of God. "By thir example they motivate this people; by imparting a hidden, apostolic fruitfulness, they make this people grow" (P.C.7).

"Total separation" from the human community is impossible even as a goal, let alone in actual fact. Perfection is not an individual option, but a question of growth in Christ, deepening our union with Him in and through the Church, and consequently our participation in the life of the Church. This automatically implies integration with our brethren in Christ, with whom we live and grow in the spiritual organism of the Mystical Body of which we are all members, bearing one another's burden, acting as mutual instruments of divine providence. Those who enter most fully into the life-giving community of the faithful who dwell in Christ are the most sanctified.

For the contemplative, as for every Christian, there is a vital, essential link with the world. Straining forward towards another life — endeavouring to live it in some measure even here below — we still live in this world, eat, drink and work in some manner to earn our bread.

The contemplative institute, then, must be in contact with the world, through service, hospitality, work, social relationships; subject to the rules of enclosure certainly, but based upon the natural solidarity of human beings. "Dialogue" was one of the key phrases of Vatican II, and the contemplative orders must

engage in dialogue with the world. But if fundamental adaptation and renewal are ever to become a *fait accompli* and not remain a string of stirring but purely theoretical exhortations in a conciliar decree, jurisdiction for nuns must become more flexible, and no longer be the exclusive preserve of male canonists or even men of the same order.

"It is not fitting that the rules for contemplative houses of women should be made exclusively by men, even if these men belong to the same order as the nuns . . . why [asks Bishop Huyghe of Arras] should women not be allowed to share in the work of reformation themselves, as they are the principal persons to be affected by it?"

*Why indeed. . . ?*

### *A Theology of Women*

Nuns are really the only ones fully qualified to understand and settle the conditions most likely to foster the feminine contemplative life in the 20th century, but at present they have neither a general chapter of their own, nor authority to alter existing legislation, being subject to that of the first (or male) order.

*Perfectae caritatis* reasserted the value of the purely contemplative life, but merely confirmed the traditional formulations. It exhorted religious to adapt their manner of living, praying and working to the physical and psychological conditions of our day (No. 3), to extend religious training in doctrinal and technical fields (No. 18), and in general warned nuns not to grow smugly complacent, but to apply themselves speedily to reform wherever necessary in order to catch up with the Church in an evolving world. However, it stopped short at this initial call to *aggiornamento* without offering specific guidelines or, in the case of enclosed nuns, any extension of their restricted powers in this matter. What the decree has done is confirm the recommendations and exhortations made time after time by Pope Pius XII, who did more than any other modern Pope to emancipate contemplative nuns and make it possible for them to assume their role in the Church as mature and responsible women.

Writing in *Review for Religious*, an eminent Canadian theologian, Fr. J. M. R. Tillard, O.P., drew attention to the lack of differentia-

tion between the religious life for men and women in the decree:

"The text has been drafted by men in terms of problems posed for a masculine mentality. Up to now, it is true, religious women have not had a word to say about all the legislation that concerns them. In general, there has been applied to them the same discipline as that of religious men except at points where there is apparent a certain distrust of the ability of women to conduct their own affairs or where small details are heaped up. It is surprising that at the time when woman is becoming more and more aware of her specific values and of the irreplaceable contribution of her femininity to the human mystery, the decree on religious life continues to maintain the traditional attitude of treating men and women in the same way and does not even seek to arouse a movement of research on the subject . . . of the difference between the two temperaments, masculine and feminine. Our religious laws are made by men. But the same text has different resonances in a man's psychology and in a woman's . . . A serious attention to feminine religious life would have permitted a clean break with the politic of ignorance and mistrust which the Church has experienced up to now with regard to the feminine contribution to the concrete life of pastoral reflection and of typically ecclesial action."

An American Benedictine nun, Sister Judith Tate, is equally outspoken against discriminative legislation in *Sisters for the World*, a book warmly praised by religious men:

"It is commonly known that the Code of Canon Law for sisters needs reforming, that rules and constitutions need revising, and that the general structure needs reshaping. There are Canons, for example, which intrude into the sister's private life in such a way as to seem to indicate that she is the least trusted of all Christians. No other adult Christian is required by law to submit to mail inspection or to be told to go to confession once weekly."

However, in no area does the lack of feminine contribution to the framing of these laws become so apparent as in that concerning enclosure of nuns which has, over the past few centuries, become for all practical purposes synonymous with imprisonment. Yet

enclosure is merely a matter of ingress and egress, an external definition of the limits of cloister, whose purpose is to safeguard the solitude essential to the contemplative life.

### *The Nun in the World*

Since Cardinal Suenens' widely read opinions on this subject are well known, many have felt disappointed that his positive recommendations in *The Nun in the World* were neither discussed in the Council, incorporated in the Decree, nor adopted generally by nuns themselves. A little background information might be helpful here.

The contemplative life should not be an institution with a rigid **framework** that absolutely rules out all "active" work for the apostolate, although of course it will of its nature restrict the type of work and exclude certain specific undertakings which are fundamentally incompatible. But the whole concept is doubly confounded by the confusion that has grown up around the active/contemplative dichotomy which is at best artificial and at worst false. These classifications are a comparatively modern innovation. In monastic tradition and the writings of the Fathers, the term "active" and "contemplative" do not represent two separate and conflicting states of life deriving their distinctive character from the work engaged in. They were rather two stages of the same spiritual growth. "Active life" represented the practice of the virtues, while "contemplative life" was union with God, knowledge and experience of His love: in other words the goal for which the active asceticism was a preparation and training. These two elements are fundamental to every Christian life. No teacher, missionary or nurse is so involved in round-the-clock activity as never to have any time for prayer; nor is there a "pure contemplative" so removed from material needs and the demands of charity that she never engages in some form of activity. Nevertheless there do exist in the Church orders whose primary purpose is to promote the prayer-life of their members, and others constituted for the end-purpose of charitable and apostolic works. Each has its own place in building up the Church and Kingdom. One is not any better than the other; like the hand and the foot of the famous Pauline analogy, they simply have different functions. Every active missionary since St. Paul recognizes the need of a vital prayer life if his apostolate is to be fruitful, and it is only in this sense that the Church has

consistently championed the need and value of the contemplative life.

### *Christian Involvement*

The current use of the word "nun" as a general title for all female religious has created some confusion, since strictly speaking, the word (derived from *moniale*, meaning solitary or "alone with God") signifies only the cloistered nun under solemn vows, obliged to choral recitation of the divine office. Cardinal Suenens was not referring to "nuns" in this restricted sense in his book, and in fact specifically excluded them from his observations: "We shall be concerned only with nuns belonging to orders and congregations dedicated to apostolic work. The contemplative life, which is on a different plane altogether, is not considered here".

Thus, when (as frequently happens) laymen ask why nuns are not implementing any of the Cardinal's recommendations in regard to habit, hours of work, type of apostolate, visiting relatives, becoming an integral part of the local community or parish, they are in fact going beyond his terms of reference. There is no likelihood that enclosed nuns will ever take holidays either in their parents' homes or elsewhere outside their cloister; although it is likely that the absolute ban on leaving the enclosure to visit a sick or dying parent will in the near future be generally waived at the local superior's discretion. But holidays with one's family, either in the home or at some resort, is diametrically opposed to the whole concept of "withdrawal from the world" and its legitimate but distracting pleasures. Such absolute severance certainly makes the renunciation painful for the family of the daughter who elects to enter the cloister, but this is part of the unconditional demand of Our Lord, and it is one area where, having put our hand to the plough, we should not look back.

Becoming an integral part of the community, however, is an altogether different matter, and enclosure should never be a barrier to that. There is no justification for remaining aloof from the life of the local or universal Church, because in embracing her vocation, the nun places herself at the heart of the Church, and loses interest neither in the spiritual nor the material welfare of her fellow-Christians. There should be no sorrow, misery or any human condition to which she is a stranger or uninvolved — that is not the purpose of her separation from the world, which can

never exclude a certain measure of communion with society. The contemplative institute cannot wall itself up in a narrow individualism, since before all else it is a function in the Church. Its traditions are not prerogatives; its privileges carry corresponding responsibilities. It is for contemplatives to give "dialogue with the world" a precise form and prudent measure in keeping with the spirit of their essential eremitism and withdrawal from secular life and preoccupation, and thus bring men back to the unity they have lost. This is why the legislation for the contemplative life or any particular institute should not exclude unconditionally any activity whatsoever outside the enclosure, for that is to make an end of the cloister which is but a means. I am not suggesting that cloistered nuns should undertake the work of Simon Communities, or monks engage in labour disputes or missions to seamen; but neither can one maintain the untenable alternative: You do the work and I'll do the praying or *vice versa*, depending upon temperament and attractions.

The basic group or community is simply a number of people who have voluntarily elected to come together in an attempt to live the gospel to the fullest possible extent. That is the specific aim, and it does not exclude service for a fellow-man in need simply because he happens to be on the other side of the wall. The community by its commitment will certainly feel the need to avoid involvement in secular affairs, trade or politics; they are obliged to earn their own living, and the hours spent in prayer will be a reminder and a valuable witness to their neighbours that man's ultimate destiny does not lie in this world. The contemplative institutes exist, after all, to promote the prayer life in their members and the Church. This has been assumed as biblically and theologically justified for the whole of her history, down to the present generation, whose sole criterion appears to be based upon secular values, and who do not seem to have a very clear understanding of history or else are determined on cutting adrift from the past. We see this in the tendency to pick and choose among papal pronouncements and conciliar decrees, selecting some passages and rejecting others out of hand, or shifting the emphasis at the expense of the overall picture.

It is not only in the Decree on Religious Life that the Council has reasserted the primacy of prayer and the contemplative life, but in all its documents. Perhaps the strongest insistence comes

in the place where it might least be expected, the Decree on Missionary Activity which states (Art. 40) that "institutes of the contemplative life are of paramount importance in the conversion of souls" and asks that foundations be made in mission countries "so that by living there in a manner adapted to the genuinely religious traditions of the people, they may bear splendid witness among non-Christians to the majesty and love of God as well as to union in Christ".

The adaptation to indigenous traditions and culture is so important that it will be discussed in a separate article, but the point of note here is that, despite the urgent need of the active apostolate, communities of contemplatives are being asked to make foundations in mission lands in order to devote themselves exclusively to prayer, not to make available more manpower for hard-pressed ordinaries and vicars apostolic of those lands.

Again in the Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops, this question of the "urgent needs of souls and the scarcity of diocesan clergy" brings the Fathers to the question of otherwise exempt religious who may be pressed into service for pastoral work. "Religious communities which are not dedicated exclusively to the contemplative life, can be called upon by the bishops to assist in various pastoral ministries" (No. 35). It is thus acknowledged that the power of bishops to co-opt religious does not extend to the purely contemplative orders, such as Carthusians, Trappists and Carmelite nuns. Priests of the monastic orders (e.g. Benedictines) may in emergency be asked to serve in parishes and other diocesan work for a limited time, but even with them it is not to be considered normal for a monk to live for any extended period outside his monastery, since the whole of his service should normally be carried out within the cloister.

The contemplative institutes exist to promote the prayer life in their members and the Church, and unless they provide this service their mode of life can have no justification. Monasteries cannot be made retreat houses or catechetical centres or soup kitchens—except under the passing emergency of some crisis, for "necessity hath no law", or rather it supersedes all law which is fulfilled in charity. It is for instance well known that during the Nazi persecution in Italy, Pope Pius XII ordered that all religious houses, including cloistered nuns, open their doors to Jewish refugees and offer them temporary sanctuary until they could be

got safely out of the country. To refuse, even without such a lead, would clearly have been inhuman, the kind of rigid adherence to regulations that once lead an Army Stores clerk to refuse, in the confusion of an air raid, to issue urgently needed supplies because the necessary form could not be signed by the appropriate official. However, when there is no such need, or it has passed, they can and should devote themselves entirely to prayer.

*You are living by grace, not by law*

Legalism was the characteristic of Old Testament pharisaism at which Our Lord so often lashed out. It was the New Testament that introduced respect for the human person, but this too has become overlaid with restrictions and regulations. In the past centuries we have fallen into juridical ways of thinking, slipping into the facile security offered by the law. Now the Council is sending us back to sources to distinguish clearly between traditions and Tradition, rules and the Rule. All regulations and customs must undergo periodical refurbishing in order to bring them into line with the spirit of the Rule and the evolving social milieu. Too many "traditions" of religious life have nothing intrinsically to do with religion at all, but have merely become encrusted like barnacles, because they were the social norms of the bygone era in which our founders lived, and whatever our holy fathers did must be preserved intact, down to the last domestic arrangement.

Some religious speak as if their essential "spirit" would be jeopardized if they brought their horarium into line with the 20th century rather than that of a peasant agricultural community which worked, slept and prayed according to the daylight hours and changing seasons. Others think that any suggestion of modernizing or modifying the religious habit is tantamount to secularization. Yet few would agree that wearing heavy unhygienic clothing is an acceptable form of penance, since the effect on the wearer is to fatigue and reduce efficiency and capacity. Nuns are hardly likely to adopt mini-skirts or dress like their secular sisters; but habits could and should be shorter and lighter, so that wasted energy may be diverted into more productive activities than mere physical endurance. This is a glaring example of extending the norms of an era long past, which are purposeless in themselves and even ridiculous today. Once all women wore such clothing. When so many reforms were undertaken in the 16th century, most of the reformers in the

mendicant orders adopted sandals as footwear, that being then regarded as the ultimate in austerity, so that the term "discalced" (barefooted) became more or less synonymous with "reformed".

I would like to close with a small anecdote. About ten years ago a national Marian pilgrimage was held in a predominantly Nonconformist area, at the height of a blazing summer. Most religious orders were represented, and the sight of the friars—Carmelites, Franciscans and Passionists — walking in procession barefooted and in sandals gave the impression of anything but austerity. They were probably the most comfortably shod people there, and their casual appearance shocked and disedified a Baptist minister who naturally concluded that in the extreme heat, these religious had simply discarded their restricting shoes and socks, in favour of something cooler and more comfortable.

We are indeed meant to be a witness, but we need to review our priorities and ascertain whether we do in fact signify what our symbols were originally meant to convey. In a temporal world where everything human changes except human nature itself, it would be a rare individual, community or order that stood in no need of renovation either in observance or custom, to keep abreast of a world altering at escalation scale and pace.

---

## DON'T FORGET

That it may be time to renew your subscription for Christian Order. Send the money (see Editorial) to C. J. FALLON, LTD., Parkgate Street, Dublin 8, Ireland.

## THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

How often our reading of the scriptures is lifeless and unimaginative? We have heard the parables and the teaching of Our Lord so often that our minds are no longer fresh to the deepest meanings. In this article Fr. Rochford takes the parable of the Prodigal Son and makes it come alive in our minds.

# The Unprodigal Son

VINCENT ROCHFORD

THE made-up tale Our Lord told of the Prodigal Son is one of the greatest short stories in world literature. Generation after generation has read it and been gripped by its portrayal of human nature. Readers have put it down and placed their Bible back on the bookshelf with a more penetrating understanding of God's loving kindness than they derived even from the great prophets of Israel. They return to it again and again, always with a clearer insight. It never drags, never palls, it always yields something new.

To begin with, how much we must sympathise with the dreams of youth. The young fellow worked day after day on his father's farm as his ancestors had always done: a settled, ordered life, adding something to the value of the family enterprise with every lifetime. It might have gone on; but the lad grew restless as he listened to the tales told round the fire or outside the door under the vines by the merchants who occasionally sought lodgings for the night. The lands they travelled, the sights they had seen, their tales of different ways and outlooks, men of other colours and strange tongues. The lad had never seen a forest nor a mountain, was a stranger to the sea, could scarcely conjure up in his imagination so fantastic an object as a ship.

So the annual sowing and reaping and threshing, the wine-pressing, the daily care for the stock began to pall. Why not break from this monotonous and uneventful round, go away and travel,

see men and places and gain new experiences ?

All that he needed was money. With that he could enjoy life and gain his freedom from a narrow existence with its repetitive chores. And one day an idea came to him with the force of an inspiration: he would, eventually, inherit, along with his elder brother, his father's possessions. When would that day be ? His father was, thank God, hale and hearty, he showed no signs of decline. By the time money came to him he might be past enjoying it. His precious youth would be over. He would be stout, slower in his movements, always ready to temper any suggestion with the warnings his experience had taught him. But, it flashed on him, why wait ? Why drag out the days and weeks and months and years till he was middle-aged, his body stiff and his imagination dead ? Why not now ? Why not put it to his father, boldly ask him for his share of the estate to be given him at once, and then, heigh-ho, away to this exciting life of adventure, and let the distant future look after itself ? All he needed was courage, the temerity to approach his father with his common-sense plan.

And so, as the days passed, as he went out to the fields, as he herded the sheep and cleaned the byres, he slowly surmounted his fears, until, driven by the intensity of his ambition, he spoke to his father and laid his proposal before him.

### *Away to Freedom!*

His father was taken aback. He had noticed his son for some time given to fits of abstraction, withdrawn, dreaming. But . . . this ! It was a shock. He needed time to think it over. His immediate impulse was to reject such an impertinent suggestion. But after thinking it over, he saw little purpose in forcing an unwilling son to remain at home, sulky: it could only be a constant strain on the whole household. So, however reluctantly, he decided to give his consent. Whether he had to sell some acres, to dispose of some of his stock at unfavourable prices, we do not know. But the day finally dawned when the lad was able to ride away, after perhaps the most perfunctory farewell to his father and mother, off to "see life".

With money in his pouch, the world was his oyster: silk clothes, a handsome mount, jewels made him free of every hostelry; the simple country lad could not be expected to realise that his popularity among the communities he passed through owed more

to his gold than to his personality. We may imagine many a condescending smile on the faces of his group of townees as he called for yet another flagon of wine.

And so, when unemployment and hunger struck the land, he was without resources. Selling his finery tided him over a few weeks only. He was destitute. As an immigrant he could expect only the very worst of jobs, and was thought lucky to be taken on as swineherd, bringing the pigs to the woods every morning and getting them back to their compound in the evening. He lived in a broken-down shack, was without food, and soon was gnawing the acorns and roots which made up the diet of the swine.

### *Return Journey*

Such a manner of existence affected his health. The poor, ill-balanced food, the nights spent in the damp, miserable shack, his body covered only with a few rags, soon made him ill. In the nights, as he lay on the earthen floor, coughing and sleepless, he contrasted his wretched existence with the life he had left, and regretted with all his heart his impulsive decision. He thought his pride would never face returning home in poverty, sickness and disgrace, but if he could not face that, then he must look forward to a slow decline into death. So he made up his mind and started the long trail home, trudging along country roads down which he had ridden in his splendour, finding shelter where he could, unrecognized in the villages by those with whom he had spent some weeks as boon companion. And all the time the thought formulating itself, of regret: not only for the wretchedness he had brought on himself, not only for the disgrace of his situation, but an awareness of his hardness and ingratitude towards a loving parent. So he repeated, over and over again, the phrase he would use when he met his father: "Father, I have sinned against heaven and against you. I no longer deserve to be called your son". It was his daily refrain; but finally, when his father saw him from the gate of the farm hobbling up the dusty road, he ran out to him and clutched his head to his bosom, so that the blubbing youth could get no word out for a time.

### *Man's Thoughtlessness*

Now it is true that in the first place Our Lord meant this story to illustrate the position of Jews and Gentiles towards God. The

Gentiles were the Prodigal; the Jews the elder brother who had always stayed at home with God, but who were resentful that God should offer his salvation to the wanderers.

But at a different level lies the fact of God's mercy as it is shewn, not only to the sinful races of idolatry, but to the individuals who had left God's house to follow his own ideas and pursuits. It is this that gives the story its universal appeal down the ages.

For the man who shuts ear and heart against God's call into his friendship and to participation in his very life, is indeed the prodigal son. He knows best. He will have his own way. Whatever the cost to his Father's plan, to his brother, he will put them firmly out of his mind and go his own way. Often he will regret his choice — and that regret may start from no motive more noble than self-pity or even near-despair. But it may grow up into a remorse based on his rejection of God's love, and he will return looking for no other benefit than his Father's company and friendship, prepared even to be a slave in the household, provided it be his Father's household.

Are many of us like that? Almost certainly not. Few of us have done great wrongs either to God or man. But this may well be because we are small men. Our qualities, like our virtues, are small. We may not have the imagination that can paint for us attractive pictures of life lived in freedom from the restrictions that love of God seems to impose on us. We may lack the initiative or the courage for the clean break, for the great crime, for forthright rejection of Christian teaching.

We have always stayed at home. We have been loyal. In a sort of a way. But was the elder son not blameworthy? Did he not take all his Father's home offered, without gratitude, taking all for granted, and, as the event proved, with little share in his father's love for his brother, with no respect for his father's feelings?

Here, one feels, is a lesson and a warning for us un-prodigals. We have small cause to congratulate ourselves. We may stay at home with Christ and the Father, yet unfeeling, ungrateful, selfish, not sharing the attitudes that are their's and they wish to be ours.

## CURRENT COMMENT

Workers as well as employers can combine together to earn their living not in the service of the community, but at its expense. Britain has seen plenty of this since the second world war. This does not mean that trade unions are evil. They are good and necessary, but the strength they produce can be and is abused. This last article shows how trade-union strength can be adequately channelled when, in the interests of the common good, free competition is forced on the business community.

# The Socialist Dilemma

## 4: COMPETITION AND THE WORKER

### THE EDITOR

**M**ONOPOLY practice, of course, need not be confined to the business community. Any power group can indulge in it and, since the war, labour in Britain, equally with capital, has often placed itself in a monopolistic position over and against the consuming public. It too, has concentrated on selling a little for a lot rather than a lot for a little. Consequently, it is inflicting on economic growth the same kind of stagnation restrictionism which monopolistically minded employers have put on it for so long. Big unionism equally with big business has got the unfortunate consumer firmly within its grasp. Increasingly, he is subjected to the monopolistic depredations of both these power groups; and it is no comfort to him, whilst this is going on, to know that attention is constantly diverted from his own plight by the noisy preoccupation of each of these monsters with the business of making the other responsible for all its supposed woes.

We are confronted, at this point, with a dilemma. Apart from the political impossibility of such a proceeding, if the organized

power of the unions were broken and competitive conditions forced on the workers of this country as well as on the employers, would not this mean a return to that exploitation of labour by capital which the organization of labour into trade unions has done so much to prevent? Would not competing capitalists seek to maintain and improve their share of the market by using their naturally superior knowledge and strength to force down the wages of their workers? Under these circumstances, though the prices of their goods might fall, they would do so at the expense of the workers' wages and, since the workers make up the greater part of the consuming public, its position under such an arrangement could hardly be said to improve. That on the one hand. On the other, if labour's organized strength is left untouched whilst that of the employers is broken by competition, will not labour be tempted to use its strength to wring still greater advantages from weakened employers who will be forced to grant them and who will charge the cost of so doing to the consuming public in the shape of higher prices? Is not this what has been happening in Britain since the war? And will not a further impetus thus be given to the inflationary process, if the defences of capital are broken by competition, whilst those of labour are left untouched. Will not this exploitation of the rest of the community by organized labour continue on an increasingly powerful and, in the end, disastrous scale?

### **Full Employment**

The answer to this dilemma will be found if we keep in mind and follow out quite logically the implications of one all-important condition which must be present at the same time that competition is forced on the business community of any country. Given this condition it makes little difference whether labour is left organized or unorganized whilst employers are forced to compete amongst themselves. The condition is that labour should be fully employed; and by this one means that there should be more jobs available than there are men to fill them.

Let us examine now whether, under such circumstances, employers who are forced to compete with each other will seek to beat down wages in order to do so. It is clear at once that they cannot for, so soon as they attempt to do so, their labour force will go to where there are, because of full employment, other jobs waiting

for them.<sup>1</sup> It follows from this that competing producers, confronted with a labour supply made scarce through full employment, will not be able to maintain or improve their share of the market through a policy which forces down wages in an endeavour to lower prices and so sell more of their goods. They will be forced, instead, to substitute industrial efficiency for a policy of wage cuts; to produce more and cheaper goods by improving the productivity of their workers, instead of producing the same number of goods at the expense of their workers' wage. As a result of this, three things will happen—the wages of their workers will be increased to match their increased productive power, more goods will be produced and, thirdly, the prices of these goods will tend to fall steadily through time. Meanwhile, efficient employers will make their profit, as they should, not by monopolistic extortion, which brings stagnation to the economy; but as the result of a policy which matches efficient production to the successful anticipation of consumers' wants. Once you combine full employment with the enforcement of competition on the business community the way is cleared for the eradication of those monopoly profits which are the fruit of restrictive policies, a main source of friction between capital and

---

1 In saying this, I am not turning workers into "economic men" and assuming, in consequence, that money is their primary care and that they are perfectly responsive to its stimulus. Rather than leave his home, the worker will often be content with lower wages than he could get by moving. But this very natural inclination on his part will not withstand ceaseless pressure on his wages by an employer; and his children certainly (Britain's mining community is a case in point) will not put up with what he is prepared to put up with rather than leave familiar and well-loved surroundings. In the end men are responsive to the stimulus of higher wages.

Our point here is simply that, under conditions of full employment, competing employers will find it very difficult to push wages down in the way they are able to do when the labour force is heavily unemployed. This apart from trade-union organization, which would help, of course, to prevent such a practice. Certainly full-employment combined with trade-union organization and the enforcement of competition on the employing community, would make it as much as his life was worth for any single producer to seek to compete with his fellows on a basis of wage depreciation. Even if there were no trade union organization, employers would find it very difficult to do this, so long as full employment obtained alongside business competition.

Local depressed areas can exist conceivably under conditions of full employment; but the remedy here is for government and local authorities not to legislate for higher wages where they cannot be paid; but to assist labour through retaining and in other ways to leave the depressed area in question and travel to a relatively prosperous one.

A perfect example of the mobility of which labour is capable, even when totally unassisted, is provided by the Irish emigration to Britain since the war. One is not thereby approving of emigration as the solution of Ireland's economic problem. It is certainly not. One is citing it as an example of the kind of mobility of which labour is capable when driven to look for higher wages. As such, the Irish example lends strong support to my thesis that, given full employment, competing employers will find it very difficult to lower wages even if labour is unorganized which, of course, it is not in Britain today.

labour and, as such, impose a powerful inflationary drive to any economy. In place of this disorder, the policy we suggest will result in that efficient production, which is the basic condition of consumer satisfaction, industrial peace and true economic growth.

### **High Productivity**

Under the conditions we have just described the worker is, obviously, in an incredibly good position. In an effort to increase his productivity his employer will have been forced to place the maximum horse-power behind him and to increase his wage in accordance with his resultant increased output. Moreover, the expansion brought to the economy by the competitive process will have made the labour supply still more scarce in relation to the demand for its services and the effect will have been to increase the workers' productive power and raise his wages still further. Finally, competition will have eradicated those high monopoly profits which are such an irritant to trade unionists in this country today and which account, without a doubt, for a good deal of retaliatory monopolistic action on their part.

It is our contention that these conditions would be produced eventually under conditions of full employment (which presupposes a labour force whose mobility is assisted by State action) even were labour to remain unorganized in trade unions. We do not deny, however, that they will be produced the more quickly where there is a strong trade union movement. This is the case in this country today and it will continue to be the case. It is politically impossible to break the organized strength of trade unions in this country and it would be extremely unwise to attempt to do so. We are brought, in consequence, to the other horn of the dilemma with which we confronted ourselves at the outset of this chapter. It is this — if labour's organized strength is left untouched, as we assume to be the case, whilst that of the employer is broken by competition, will not labour be tempted to use its organized strength to extort still further wage concessions from a weakened employing class?

The answer is that at first it might be, but that, after a time, the futility of this proceeding would be made apparent to organized labour. To see why this must be so one has only to inquire into what would happen were such demands made by the unions on a particular employer. In the first place, he would not now be

able, because of competition, to pass on to the consumer in the shape of higher prices the wage increases demanded of him by the unions. To do so would be to put himself (and his workers) out of business. In the second place, he would not be able to grant these wage increases out of profits, for these—we can legitimately suppose — would already have been cut to a minimum by competition. Either way, the result of any attempt on the employer's part to meet extortionate wage demands would be bankruptcy for himself and, as a result, unemployment for his workers. Under such circumstances, extortionate attempts by organized labour to raise wages above the level determined by increased productivity, would not be tried a second time. We are safe, then, I think, in assuming that the kind of enforced competition which breaks the monopoly of big business needs only to be combined with full employment to make the monopoly of big unionism unnecessary.

### **Unions on an Industrial Basis**

The picture painted above might be rounded off with various supplementary suggestions. It would seem to be a very good thing to confine bargaining between capital and labour to company level, whilst giving the central office of the union in question a watching brief to see that no advantage locally is taken of its members. To make sure of this, job-evaluation experts, employed by the union, should already have costed the job in question and should be in on the negotiations at company level, able and ready to advise the local bargainers. They should insist that the firm be efficient and that, in fact, only efficient firms be dealt with by the union; and their aim should be to prevent, with the presentation of cold facts, either side from imposing on the other. This task would be the easier if all unions were placed on an industrial basis. Under such circumstances, industrial processes would be speeded up, many shop-floor restrictions would go, and hold-ups caused by the clash of competing crafts would be a thing of the past. It is difficult to see how, under the circumstances, the retention of the closed shop could be seen as of any benefit to anyone.

Finally, one must add that, in the case of this country, individual effort, greatly increased as it would be under competitive conditions, would be all the greater were taxation reduced from its present inequitable level. This implies the winding up of the Welfare State and the substitution in its place of a system of family allowances

based, for example, on the French model.<sup>2</sup> Discussion of that alternative would take me well outside the scope of this essay. Here I can only note the desirability of winding up the Welfare State not merely on moral grounds but because of the immense drag placed on industrial efficiency by the load of taxation found necessary to find the revenue to finance it. If men are to compete with each other in the hope of reward it is all-important that the reward should not be stripped down as it has been in Britain since the war by the demands of the tax-gatherer.

This article concludes the attempt to sketch the outline of an economic framework which is at least tolerable in this sense, that it maintains of itself and even widens that opportunity of shaping his life by responsible action within the framework of God's Law, which is the right of every individual human being. Such a framework — made up of government enforced competition resting on a basis of full employment — would allow the economic life of a country to move always in the direction of freedom and that is a great deal more than can be said for the present restrictive apparatus put upon it by the monopolistic depredations of government, capital and labour. The framework outlined in preceding articles can be described best, perhaps, as a regulated or controlled competitive order; and any government which sought to bring it about could be described truthfully as faithful to the principle of subsidiary function. Such a system allows the individual, rightly moved by the hope of private gain, to shape his own future; but it arranges things in such a way that, in so doing, he is forced to make his way forward, without damage to his personality, in the service of the community and not at its expense. This is the most that can be said of it. It is, in all truth, a very great deal.

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Family Allowances: Your Questions Answered* by Michael P. Fogarty; Catholic Social Guild, Oxford, 6d.; also *Welfare and Taxation* by Colin Clark; same publishers, 3s. 6d.

Engaged couples have many problems. Other writers have dealt, and will deal, with certain pressures which make their lives difficult. Here E. L. Way concentrates on certain practical problems: on the relationship of the engaged couple with their families, on houses, mortgages, and dry rot.

## Confetti and Dry Rot

E. L. WAY

ONE does not enter lightly into the closed enchanted world of engaged couples. They inhabit a narrow corner of Eden from which we are excluded. We seem to meet them only when the necessities of daily life have driven them, for the time being, from their refuge of happiness. They scarcely seem to see us on such occasions. We might be moths fruitlessly colliding with window-panes in our attempts to get into the little circle of light around which they huddle. And we immediately recognise their description in the following passage: ". . . . How *violent* was Mr. Bingley's love?"

"I never saw a more promising inclination; he was growing quite inattentive to other people, and wholly engrossed by her. Every time they met, it was more decided and remarkable. At his own ball he offended two or three young ladies, by not asking them to dance; and I spoke to him twice myself, without receiving an answer. Could there be finer symptoms? Is not general incivility the very essence of love?" Elizabeth Bennet, probably the most enjoyable companion in literature, with her acute observation and sparkling wit, goes to the heart of the matter when she dryly enquires: "Is not general incivility the very essence of love?" (There are greater novels than *Pride and Prejudice*. But I know no other which can match it for gaiety and freshness. I have read it six times.)

### *Narrow Corner*

Engaged couples have many problems. Other pens have dealt,

and will in future deal with certain pressures which make their lives difficult. (For in this Eden too a serpent talks a most beguiling language.) Here I am going to concentrate on practical problems: on relationships of the engaged couple with their families, on houses, on mortgages, and dry rot. And I must state at the outset that engaged couples have all my sympathy, and my most sincere best wishes. And it is necessary to say this for my own protection for I see them, I think, clearly and without romantic blinkers, and would certainly disagree with the popular saying that "all the world loves a lover". The world may well do so, but the observed fact is that families frequently lose all patience with them. The young man is like a bird waiting to migrate. The bird is filled with unrest, makes odd preparatory flights into the sky, returns to the branch it just left, and is clearly no longer at ease in the land that gave it shelter during a long summer. If the other non-migratory birds were to speak they might say to the house martin: "If you are going for Heaven's sake be gone. Don't drive us mad with your constant twittering and fluttering around the highest and best perch in the territory". The house martin would hear but pay no attention. The date for migration is fixed, and no impatience or bad temper will alter it. Similarly the young man will have the house inundated with house agents' literature from as far afield as St. Albans, Colchester, Graves End, Kew Gardens, Sheerness, and Romford. Amidst all this necessary wealth of literature, a normal sized envelope carrying an urgent and impatiently awaited letter may be lost for twenty-four hours.

### *The Diaspora*

The Jews were dispersed after the Babylonian captivity. Englishmen are dispersed in every generation. Where the young man has lived and grown up the houses are too dear to buy. And young couples are now not content with two rooms, up a flight of dark and narrow stairs. That may have been the normal beginning for the majority of newlyweds in the days when we had an empire. (There was then a chance of escape from our atrocious weather, and even worse living conditions. Now we have got to stop here, put up with the weather, and improve the living conditions. We have no option.) And houses in the parents' locality being too dear, the young couple are dispersed to areas in an ever widening circle outside London. And in these areas if the houses were built

before 1910, the mortgages tend to shrink; and the couple have to keep a sharp eye for new floor boards, and note the pointing, the lighting, and the drains. (New floor boards imply dry rot, and repointing where necessary can be expensive.) But the further you go out the higher are the railway fares. If you are lucky, that is if your income is right, you strike a spot where the fares are high but the necessary mortgage is right. You then begin to search the place for a suitable house. And if you find it the church and school may be miles away. But suppose church and school are not too far away, and the price of the house is right, and the railway fares leave a reasonable margin on which to live then, just as everything looks right, the person who is selling his house finds that the one he was going to buy has been sold to someone else. The engaged couple can either wait for five or six weeks while the others find another house, or start afresh to look for something elsewhere. It is no wonder if they are moody and silent, or take comfort in one another's arms in their narrow but enchanted Eden.

### *Incivility and Selfishness*

Naturally they become inattentive to other people. He is engrossed by her. And she is engrossed in a dream house where life will be different, and a brave new world will exist. At such moments the engaged couple tend to walk into their parental homes and look right through their parents, and their brothers and sisters. Suddenly father appears to do everything wrong. His faults begin to look monstrous. And mother, with equal suddenness, appears to be a frightful muddler. These thoughts are not spoken. They are so obvious that they don't need to be spoken. Father perhaps has an observant nature, and a caustic tongue to go with it. He dubs them "Mr. Mortgage and Mrs. Pharoah". (The young woman is so obviously a designer of pyramids, and the poor young man will have to slave at building them.) After jaunting all over the countryside in search of a place to live in, the engaged couple seek out the privacy of the front room; and after the family meal not much more is seen of them. The parents might justifiably feel that they are no longer running a home but a boarding house. No wonder every wise man's son does know that long engagements are not wise. Murderous feelings might be entertained! If the couple, however, deign to sit with the family they start hushing up the

younger members of the tribe, and this is resented by the teenage daughter. Father might dryly suggest that all the broomsticks should be unparked, and that a short flight through the air would do all the troublesome females present a power of good.

### *Looking Back*

The parents, of course, look back in joy and gratitude to their own days of courtship. The kisses may have been punctuated by sirens, and the short walk down the lane may hastily have been terminated by the descent of a chandelier, or the flight of incendiary bombs. But they were for all that the cloudless dazzling days of courtship. "Eternal summer gilds them yet." And naturally the parents wish the young folk joy, now and for the future. There is the pleasure and relief that their son has chosen a girl who is kindly, sensible, and intelligent. The mother may at times feel jealous, but these feelings of jealousy are usually smothered by the demands of the rest of the family. If her son were an only child, going off to live in the wilds of St. Albans or Colchester, she might suffer acutely. But as it is, by modern standards, a large family, mother is happy. It is not a case of:—

But mother is happy, for mother is free. . .  
For mother is dancing up forty-eight floors  
For the love of the Leeds International stores.

And the daughter who is going to found a new home — what of her? She surely has joy in the prospect of a future home where she will be of great importance to her partner. Perhaps she may have, as daughters sometimes do, a mixed feeling of sadness and relief at leaving her parental home, which is a kindly well-run place but too narrow and restricted, where her feelings are not much taken into account, and where she mingles perfectly with the well-behaved furnishings. And however delightful the parental home may be it can never match the home of her dream future.

### *Venture into the Unknown*

Marriage is at best a leap into the dark. The two have to learn to live together harmoniously. They have to learn to tolerate their in-laws. For however independent-minded you may be you just can't cut your life in two with the ease with which you cut the

wedding cake. The son may throw out open-handed invitations to his family to come and visit him. The parents will smile to themselves and will wait for an invitation from the daughter-in-law. Have they not seen invitations by husbands neatly knocked on the head by the feigned illness of the wife? (Women so often unpark their broomsticks that men learn to live with their quirks, either because they are giving way for the sake of peace and quiet, or because they are too foolish to know that they are being subjected to bit and bridle.)

### *Possessive*

It may be that women are natural empire builders, or just plain possessive, but they certainly seem to put an end to the man's close relations with his own family. More graciously put, "a son's a son till he gets him a wife; a daughter is a daughter all the days of her life". Do they resent sympathy, love or understanding between their husbands and his close relations, feeling that they are losing something in the way of influence or domestic power? Or are they sensibly cautious of outside interference? Or are men not so capable of lasting relationships with their parents as are women? Perhaps the men are tied to the wheels of an industrial Juggernaut which turns them into stone if they cast a look over their shoulder at their past. Whatever the reason the female of the species is not more deadly than the male, but can usually outsmart him in the perilous but intriguing game of family politics. The women certainly have the patience, and when you win even the smallest trick against them you can feel yourself being put into a mental pigeon-hole for some delicious revenge, some subtle pay off. And don't hope that you will get off, you won't.

### *Advice*

To those thinking about getting engaged, two pieces of advice might be proffered. Save all the money you can while you are still unengaged. (I nearly said 'free', but that is ungallant and false.) And for heaven's sake don't embark on a long courtship. Everyone grows weary of it in the end. A year is quite long enough.

There is a stupid fashion today to regard engagements as unimportant, as not binding. This fashion is in line with the general devaluation of the moral currency: contracts which are not legally enforceable are often broken without any qualms, work costing

thousands of pounds is shoddy, a huge building will let in water within a year or two of completion, and a bill for repairs will be delivered in the most barefaced manner. People sometimes talk as if personal relationships will survive a general shipwreck of public morality. They are greatly mistaken. If we do not regard our duty to the state, or nation, as of much consequence, we will by degrees eventually come to the conclusion that we need only keep faith with ourselves. A man, like an apple, goes rotten in stages. As one should not enter into an engagement to marry lightly so one should not break it off except for grave reasons. And we should not include among grave reasons the fit of nerves which assails most of us before any really important decision. Many men and women at some stage of an engagement have thought with panic: "My God! What am I doing? This can't work out", and have gone on to make happy and successful marriages. One must distinguish between a reasonable ground for putting an end to an engagement and sheer funk. For the onlooker, funk of this sort can be extremely amusing, but the person who suffers from it is far from amused. It is natural, should be carefully examined, taken into account and dismissed if not based on anything really serious. Just putting it out of your mind as an act of disloyalty to the loved one may work for the time, but may be a cause of anxiety later on. We cannot run away from our fears permanently. And when the great day comes we may be sure that we have the prayers of all our friends and relatives, and even of casual onlookers. A wedding is always moving and lovely.

---

## *A Magnificent Definition*

A Christian, said Lacordaire, "is a man to whom Jesus Christ has confided other men".

## MONTHLY REPORT

As late as 1950 there was only one Benedictine monastery south of the Sahara. There are now twelve; and there are also seven Cistercian monasteries. Monasticism has much to offer Africa: it not only gives an opportunity of leading the contemplative life, it also reveals the true dignity of manual labour, and can, by example show that education is a hill to be climbed for the view rather than a ladder to be scaled for political power. This is an abridged version of an article that appeared in the *Clergy Review*, February 1967, and is here published by courtesy of the Editor.

# Monks and Missions

GERARD RATHE, W.F.

**I**N Chapter VI of the Decree on the Missions the Vatican Council issues a clear call to the Contemplative Orders of the Church to bring their way of life to the missions. It begs these Institutes . . . "to found houses in mission places, as many have already done, so that there, leading their life in a way suited to the genuinely religious traditions of the people, they may bear outstanding witness to the majesty and charity of God and of union in Christ among non-Christians".

### Role of the Monk

The role of the Contemplative in the Church has always been to bear witness to the primacy of the spiritual. For a complete manifestation of that life which Christ came to bring to all men "more abundantly" there must be two things: the active or mixed life and the contemplative life. The active life is first of all that of the missionary whose task, like that of the Apostles, is to extend the Church by his preaching and baptising. Closely linked with this is the work of the pastoral clergy specifically charged with the

care of the baptised faithful. The root of all apostolic and pastoral work, however, must be the contemplative life, emphasising the importance of prayer and worship, which form the true basis of all Christian development. The life of the Contemplatives is the highest act of charity in the Church, albeit less obvious to the human eye. They join Christ in His prayer to bring down blessings and graces on the whole of mankind.

In fact, so much is written today about the desperate shortage of priests for missionary and pastoral work in these lands that the call to the Contemplative Orders made by the Fathers of Vatican II risks being overlooked.

There are many Orders of Contemplatives and the developing Church covers some two-thirds of the world, so to pinpoint the problem this article deals only with tropical Africa and with monks. If the emphasis seems to be on the sons of Saint Benedict, Cistercians and Benedictines, it is because, so far, only these monks have answered the call of recent Popes before the Council and are actually to be found in the areas under consideration.

The African daily witnesses the feverish activity of the Christian missionary, and of all those connected with the Church, to better the material lot of his people. The very poverty of his country demands this preoccupation. This can be to the detriment of spiritual values, however, and it is for the monk to show that material things exist for the sake of man, and man for the sake of God. The truths of the Beatitudes are as valid for Africa as for anywhere else in the world and it is the monk who must bear daily witness to them by his life. He must be *seen* to put prayer first, his detachment must be clear to all and he is specially fitted to fulfil the demands of courtesy and hospitality so important to the African, and so much a part of his own Benedictine heritage.

At a general meeting of the monastic orders of Africa (monks and nuns), held at Bouraké (Ivory Coast) in 1964, the Abbot of Saint André stated that Africa needs monks fully conscious of their special vocation in the Church; living as men of prayer, practising fraternal charity in a Common Life and following the teaching of the ancient monks and the rule of Saint Benedict. He stressed that it was not for the monastery to assume the task of direct evangelisation, and that hence a monastery should be founded where faith was already well established and where the monks could live as monks and so bring before the people of Africa that spiritual com-

plement which would always be lacking as long as the monastic orders were not present.

### **Special Difficulty**

There is, however, special difficulty in Africa, and other developing countries. In areas almost destitute of priests it is understandable that any large group of priests who do not serve souls by the active pastoral exercise of their ministry will produce severe tensions between themselves and the bishops and what few priests there may be engaged in the active apostolate. If, in answer to the demands of priestly charity, the majority of choir monks leave their monastery to work outside, they will no longer bear witness by the monastic life which Vatican II and recent Popes have set them as their special mission.

Dom Léclercq, a monk from Clervaux, points out that the Benedictine monastic tradition has never been one of pure contemplation, and that even though monasticism belongs to the contemplative type of religious life, as history shows, it has never excluded a certain amount of varied activity. Monasticism has simply given an institutional form to practices and aspirations inherent in every life in Christ. There was no question of a Christian ideal different from that of all, nor of a Christian life more perfect than that of the generality of Christians. From their origin monks have made their essential aim the imitation of Christ as proposed to all men by the Gospel.

Viewed in this way monasticism has much to offer Africa, for the Benedictine life, like Christianity itself, is a way of life much more than a set of rules. As such, it is more flexible and adaptable to Africans than are the many Societies based on the Ignatian rule. These prepare a man for a specific apostolic task in the Church and for this reason are less open to other influences. They are more rigid and detailed in their rules and by that very fact tend to produce a "type" more westernised, less universal, less adaptable, less easily Africanised. The monk, however, by his vocation is simply the perfect Christian living the evangelical counsels to the full in a Common Life.

Monastic values are universal and valid for any Christian life, but in fact it will be extremely difficult to separate these values from their Western occidentals. Pius XII said of Saint Benedict, "his role was not so much to bring the ideal of the monastic life

from the East to the West, as to harmonise and fittingly to adapt it to the temperament, the needs and the customs of the people of Europe". His sons are called again to do likewise for mission lands.

The first efforts in Africa inevitably carry a risk of Westernisation. Africanisation can really come only through the Africans themselves. Thus those who would be missionaries of monasticism, who seek to found an African monasticism, must themselves be monks first and above all else, otherwise whatever good they do, they will not found African monasticism, which is precisely what the Vatican Council is asking for.

### **Early Attempts**

Monks living as monks have not been long in tropical Africa. Twenty years ago, apart from North Africa and Ethiopia, in an area over four times the size of India, with some 20 million Catholics, there was not a single monastery to bear witness to the religious life as the perfection of the Christian calling.

As early as 1882 fifty Trappist monks went to Natal from Maria Stern in Bosnia to bring the Trappist way of life to Africa. By 1909 they had become the Mariannhill Missionaries, entirely separated from the Cistercian Order, for it had soon become obvious to all that the urgent needs of the apostolate were incompatible with the monastic life. They were monk-missionaries like many of their brethren in the history of monasticism; perhaps like those first monks sent by Pope Gregory to Britain. They were not, however, missionary-monks founding an African monasticism. The time for that had not yet come.

In 1907 monks from the Benedictine Abbey of Saint André, near Bruges, went to the southern tip of the Congo, to Katanga, to found a monastery just as had been done in medieval times. Theirs was to be the life of the cloistered monk and they took with them secular priests to take charge of the missionary and pastoral ministry. When they arrived, however, such was the obvious and pressing need for missionary priests that the Benedictines sacrificed the building of their monastery to found missions; their Prior became Vicar Apostolic and they radiated over an area the size of Ireland, which when the writer visited them in 1957, contained over 400 churches and bush chapels and had 150,000 Catholics.

In such a situation there was no need to wait for any Council

to emphasise that the priesthood is for the service of the Church. No monk-priest could refuse the pastoral call of charity in such circumstances and for a time it seemed another failure to found a monastery; to bring monastic Benedictinism to Africa.

The dream of a monastery in Africa, however, was never forgotten by the monks of Saint André, and strangely enough it was realised through a lay-Brother — a point worth remembering. Fr. Charles van de Straten had a certain Brother Gabriel working with him. Gabriel had a withered arm. One day an African with a crippled leg came and said "Brother serves God with a withered arm, cannot I serve Him with one leg?" That cripple became Brother Simon, O.S.B., and that is how the monastery of Kansenia ( " The Little Antelope " ) started in 1945. Eight other Africans joined Simon, all with the same request: " Tusaka kwingidila Lesa " — " We want to work for God ". When the writer visited their monastery at Kansenia twelve years later there were 70 African monks at various stages of formation, building their own monastery in the African bush. The number rose to 100; now there are fourteen.

### **Apparent Failure**

At the Bouaké meeting in 1964, the former Prior of Kansenia, Dom Déchanet gave what he saw as the reasons for the apparent failure of the monastery.

First, that pure and simple aspiration to give their work to God without reward did not survive contact with the European monk, who typified by his very standing as a priest and a scholar, a higher station in life, a promotion to be looked for within the monastic life itself. The African of Katanga had lived in a colonial and paternalistic atmosphere for years and it would take more time and patience to gain his confidence and win that openness of spirit essential for the religious life. The candidates had become so used to submission and trying to please that they did not communicate their feelings and reactions. Finally, there was a serious lack of real maturity, due to long-standing undernourishment and to an almost complete lack of family education. When studies started and intellectual progress was made, one after another they left to seek positions in the world opened to them because of their increased education. This is itself a sad consequence of that general policy of neglecting higher production while concentrating on a

general basic education throughout the country. Any man with a "little more" becomes by that fact "outstanding".

### **Foundations**

As late as 1950 Kansenia was still the only Benedictine monastery south of the Sahara. There are now 12, and seven monasteries of Cistercian monks.

In November 1964 they had a total of 94 European monks (72 of them priests) and 68 African monks professed or temporary professed (six of them priests). However, the Peramiho monastery had 44 of these Africans and eight monasteries had no professed African monks at all. The Cistercians in seven monasteries had a total of 81 European monks (of whom 44 were priests) and 26 African monks (five of them priests). The monastery of Bela-Vista in Angola with 30 Europeans (eight priests) is the only exception to the general picture of Communities varying from six to ten Europeans and from one to seven Africans.

### **Too Early?**

Some say it is too early to think of true monasticism for Africa, others that it has been tried but failed. But ten years is not long to sow the seeds of contemplation, and it is worth remembering that in Uganda only one out of an original 60 aspirants reached the priesthood and that was 20 years after the first seminarists were enrolled.

It seems clear, however, that a full community of European priest-monks will never convey the ideal of a monk who is not also a priest to a people who judge by what they see and not by what they are told. This is a special problem and challenge to the sons of Saint Benedict from Africa and similar developing areas, one of many difficulties they alone can resolve.

For the vast majority of Africans, religious vocation can only be to the priesthood in the pastoral service of their people; it is all they have seen, the only thing to which they can aspire. It fits in with their concept of life and it is hard for an African to understand that a talent, especially that of the mind, should apparently be hidden and not put directly to the service of his own people. In fact, it may be many years before it is accepted, but it will never be understood without the patient witness shown by monks dedicated to a life of prayer and worship.

## **Agriculture and Education**

Africa is poor, extremely poor in most areas, and the monk, while sharing this poverty, is called by charity to help those among whom he lives to better their lot; to provide a minimum standard of material well-being, the daily bread of the body. In Africa the whole family, clan or tribe shares everything in common, thus it is of great importance that the Christian monk share all he has, especially his knowledge and skill, with all those around him. This should be possible without detriment to the essentials of the contemplative life. History shows a multitude of "works" by Benedictine monks, for Saint Benedict broke from the monastic traditions of the East in reconciling activity with a life of prayer and solitude.

In the past, monks have been pioneers of better husbandry and there is dire need of this in Africa where the vast majority of the people must live off the land. Better methods of agriculture, the breaking down of harmful customs and taboos is more effectively done by example than by any number of lectures. Manual work is one of the five principles of the Benedictine life, and in many parts of Africa an example of the nobility of such work (often regarded as the exclusive realm of the woman) is both timely and necessary if the land itself is to provide to its full capacity, and some counter-measure is to be applied to stem the suicidal rush from the land to the towns. In this the characteristic Cistercian emphasis on manual work is invaluable.

Africa is hungry for education. In fact, hunger of the mind seems to beset the newly independent African even more than hunger of the body. One of the great lessons the monk-scholar can bring is that education and learning are things good in themselves, bettering and enriching a man; not simply stepping stones to political power. Africa is in such need of adequately educated people for the many tasks the new countries now have to face that anyone with that little extra learning and training finds the attractions of office hard to resist as the experiments at the Kansenia monastery indicate.

## **Hospitality**

Hospitality and courtesy have a special place in African life, and missionary efforts are often jeopardised by a failure to observe the customs of politeness. Here, true to Benedictine tradition, the

monasteries have an important role to fulfil. This sense of hospitality and courtesy supposes a strong community spirit, a true detachment from material things, and above all a deep sense of the dignity and worth of every individual. Perhaps this last is one of the most valuable things the monk can bring to the people of Africa, with whom he can share not only his limited material goods but much more the spiritual riches he possesses. The priesthood inevitably carries with it an aura of power and superiority, perhaps, regrettable though it be, a certain pomp is still called for in a continent where authority is naturally surrounded by such external signs. The monk does his work in humility and charity, by simplicity and devotion, through the evident witness of his union with God by prayer and of his union with others in Christ . . . "By this all men shall know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another" (John xiii, 35).

If anything the Roman liturgy is too cold and abstract to satisfy the African fully. Dom Léclercq remarked at the Bouaké meeting that the Eastern liturgies, especially that of Ethiopia seem more in harmony with the soul of Africa than does our Western liturgy. However that may be, there is an urgent need to see that whatever we of the West pass on shall be true Christianity and not a Christianity plus the specific Western form it takes in our lives. This has been almost impossible till recently. The same is now true of monasticism, for in both cases a detached readiness to preserve and consecrate whatever is good in the African heritage is demanded. Tradition is a living current flowing from the past but open to the future. True to this the monk in Africa is called upon to pass on the spiritual riches of a monasticism which, however, is open to benefit from the unexpected riches of the people to whom he comes.

The African has a strong family spirit extending often to the whole clan or tribe and which he jealously guards. He would find himself much at home within the Benedictine family of the monastery once he had grasped the new bonds of charity and brotherly love existing there. He is very much a social being and less prepared for the eremitical life than for the cenobitical. Herein lies a difficulty as well as a mission for the monk of Africa. The tribal ties are strong and often exclusive, yet the monastery will have to accept candidates from a variety of tribes. In so doing it must be able to maintain its own spirit of charity and mutual

esteem for all, providing a living testimony of love among brothers who would not naturally agree to live in the same family, let alone be subject to the member of another, perhaps rival, clan. This lesson in fraternal charity is of great importance not only for the Church itself but even for the newly independent nations trying to create unity out of many rival tribes.

### **Not Indifferent**

As the monastic life is one of humility in the Church it does not directly prepare members for hierarchial charges and its aim is normally exclusive of all pastoral work. This does not mean that the monks are indifferent to the influence their monastery must have by prayer and by the practice of charity. Their traditional hospitality will enable them to satisfy the spiritual and bodily needs of those who come to them to seek peace, help and comfort, so long as the essential conditions of silence and recollection are respected.

The primary aim of monastic foundations in Africa is to enable those Africans, who feel so called by God, to realise the contemplative ideal in a state consecrated by the Church and thus to achieve the full founding of monasticism in their own land. The monk (and contemplative nun) is urgently needed today to complete in the developing Church the message of that fullness of life which Christ came to bring to all men in abundance.

## INDUSTRIAL ANGLE

There have been a few schools of thought about property. The most foolish has sought to abolish it because of the abuses to which it leads. Another school has thought that property was so right and proper that they confined its use to themselves and their privileged friends. The Church has traditionally held that its use should be widely distributed. Some day we must get round to trying this solution. It is mainly our greed and short-sightedness which prevents us from seeing that the best defence of property is its widest possible distribution.

# What Kind of Economic System ?

## (4) PROPERTY AND ECONOMIC POWER

J. M. JACKSON

**T**HERE has always been considerable emphasis in Catholic social teaching on the importance of a widespread distribution of property. Although the Church has traditionally upheld the right to private property, including ownership of the means of production, she has never favoured a system in which such property and the power that goes with it was concentrated in a few hands. Unfortunately, there have been too few would-be reformers who have taken the Church's social teaching seriously. Catholics, like most other people, have tended either to accept the *status quo* in western societies whereby the few who own the capital of industry exercise an undue degree of control over the economic system\* or else they seek a remedy in a socialist denial of the rights of all private property.

---

\* It is, of course, all too easy for the critics of the *status quo* to exaggerate the degree of control that can be exercised in this way.

There have, of course, been some Catholic idealists who have sought to build a type of society that is fundamentally different from both socialism and from industrial monopoly capitalism. All too often, however, these people have been quite unrealistic in their approach. It is no answer to the problem of our day to try and turn back the clock and to reject the benefits of industrialisation. One may paint an idyllic picture of an economy consisting of small farms and small workshops; where there are many owners, each perhaps employing a few men, many of whom can hope in turn to become small employers with their own farm or workshop. This sounds attractive, but such a system cannot achieve the level of output that is required to support a large and rapidly growing population. Small scale production may sometimes yield superior products, but not for the millions to enjoy. And let us not forget that there is still a great deal of poverty and misery in this rich country of ours, to say nothing of those living in less favoured parts of the world. Men like Chesterton and Gill were no doubt right in much of their criticism of the economic system under which men were living, but they made no constructive contribution to the framing of a better society.

### *The Role of Property*

We need to begin by asking what should be the role of property. One important idea running through much of Catholic social teaching is that property gives a man a measure of security. We shall need to see how far this is true under modern conditions, and to what extent it is desirable that a man should provide for his future needs through the acquisition of property and how far through other means. Or it may rather be a case of seeing how under our sophisticated modern system property is taking much more subtle forms than the simple ownership of a piece of land or of buildings and machinery.

Property has always carried some degree of power. If a man owns a piece of land, for example, he can decide how he will use it. Will he use it to grow wheat to provide bread for a hungry population, or for grazing cattle in order to provide them with meat and milk and various by-products, or as a golf course where the wealthy may enjoy themselves? The Church has always insisted that although property may be privately owned, except where in a particular case it confers too much power to be left

in private hands, there is still an over-riding obligation that it should be used to promote the public good. Thus it would be quite wrong to convert arable land into a golf course at a time when many people are starving. On the other hand, this is not to deny that in normal circumstances, the operation of the market mechanism and the profit motive may not give a reasonable indication of the priorities that ought to be adopted.

An economy made up of small farms and workshops, each separately owned, would not have any problems arising from the concentration of economic power in a few hands. Today, however, it is the large unit which is typical. Although the vast majority of business firms are small, it is the relatively few large units that account for the greater part of production and employment. These large units are generally public companies, in which shares are held by a great many people. Sometimes there may be a few really big shareholders who exercise the real power. Often, however, the real power lies with a self-perpetuating managerial group. They are in control and it is very unlikely that anything will happen to displace them. The many small shareholders are unlikely to turn up to company meetings. If they live outside London, where most big companies have their headquarters, it will not be worthwhile their paying the fare to attend the meeting. In this kind of situation, we have a concentration of economic power depending not on ownership of property but upon managerial control. Ownership may be widespread, but because of this very fact ownership in itself ceases to carry real power, which passes instead to the managers.

### *Property and Security*

The ownership of some form of property clearly confers on the owner some measure of security. If, for example, a man owns his own small farm, he is not dependent for his livelihood on retaining the goodwill of an employer. It cannot, however, provide him with an adequate measure of protection against all eventualities. If trade is bad, employees in a good many occupations may be in danger of unemployment. The small farmer or shopkeeper or small workshop owner is in a different position. They may try to keep going, especially if they and their immediate families provide most of the labour for the enterprise. They will still be hit by the depressed state of trade. The shopkeeper may have few sales by

comparison with normal times; the farmer may find prices are much lower than usual; the small manufacturer may suffer in both ways. Which ever way the blow falls, these small, independent producers are by no means insulated from the effects of fluctuations in general trading conditions. Indeed, if things get very bad, they may even go bankrupt and lose their status as independent producers and drop back into the ranks of the employees (or the unemployed).

The ownership of a small productive enterprise (whether farm or shop or factory) may give a measure of security against arbitrary dismissal but it cannot give complete security against trade fluctuations, nor can it give security against sickness and the like. A man may derive a reasonable income from his farm so long as he can work it himself, perhaps with the help of one or two employees. If he falls sick, however, it may be difficult to keep the farm running. If he is permanently incapacitated, it will not produce a sufficient profit to give him a reasonable income *and* pay a manager. Similarly, if he dies, his wife cannot afford to employ a manager. In either of these events, the only course is to sell the farm. This may help to provide for the future needs of the incapacitated man and his family, or for his widow if he dies, but it is unlikely to make *adequate* provision.

Much the same is true of property that takes the form of a share in a larger enterprise. It is always a help in an emergency if a man has same kind of property that he can either derive an income from or sell. Few people, however, are likely to own shares and the like to an extent that would yield them an adequate income in time of sickness, incapacity or widowhood. A man with a family would need to provide himself with an income of £10 a week or more in the event of his being sick. To get such an income from shares, he might need to own shares worth something like £15,000. Very few people indeed own any kind of property approaching this value. Of course, a man may, on average, have only two weeks sickness a year. If he could derive an income from shares of say £20 or £25 a year, this would tide him over his couple of weeks sickness, and this would require owning shares worth something like £600 to £700 only, a much more possible figure. Here the trouble is that provision is made only for an average amount of sickness. The man who is permanently incapacitated cannot manage on £20 or £25 a year, and indeed could easily run through the capital of £600 or £700 in a single year.

### *Other Types of Claim*

It is for this reason that other means must be found of providing for those who are sick or widowed and so on. The two previous articles in this series have, in fact, dealt with a number of aspects of our social security. In *Mater et Magistra*, Pope John stressed the importance of rights arising from employment in providing security for the worker in addition to the more traditional kinds of property. Full security can only be gained if men cooperate and there is some kind of insurance scheme operating to cover them in certain eventualities. As far as possible, these schemes should be based on employment, and the subject of agreements between workers and employers, and subject to their joint control. There may be need of a residual role to be played by the state, especially in relation to long-term disability.

On the other hand, it is wrong to make too much of the distinction between this kind of claim and the more traditional kind of property right. I have argued that ideally there should be insurance or social security schemes based on employment rather than an all embracing national scheme run by the state. Improvements in a scheme based on employment may be the subject of collective bargaining, and workers may be in a position to make a responsible choice between improved sick pay and pension schemes, for example, and bigger pay packets. If, however, everybody is forced into an all embracing state scheme, there is a danger that financial stringency may slow down the rate of advance by denying the exercise of free choice.\*

Certain types of provision can reasonably be made from current income. Employers should regard sick pay schemes, for example, as a cost to be met out of current revenues. Pensions are in a different position. These are normally paid for out of joint contributions from the workers and employers. It is essential, however, that these contributions should not be used to pay pensions to those already retired. This can only be done so long as the firm remains in business. If it is to guarantee a pension to a man regardless of whether the individual enterprise continues to exist or not, a funded scheme is essential. This means that the

---

\* It must not be thought that this implies support for all the critics of the present welfare services. Some of these are advocating measures which would throw the cost of certain services onto the ordinary income of some people whom they think could afford it. Very little attention has been given by some of these critics to the development of reasonable alternatives to the present state system in the form of adequate insurance schemes.

pension fund must accumulate a sufficient sum by the time a man retires to purchase an appropriate annuity on his behalf.\* This, in the last resort, the pension, although a claim arising from employment, is only really secure in so far as it is backed by the more traditional property right.

### *Property and Power*

There are clearly dangers in the concentration of economic power. It matters little whether the power is conferred by the ownership of certain kinds of property or whether it is conferred by the holding of certain managerial roles. If it were wrong that power should be concentrated in the hands of a few property owners, it is equally wrong that power should lie with a relatively small and self-perpetuating managerial class. Most of the social encyclicals have advocated some measure of profit-sharing or co-partnership between workers and capitalists, and there is certainly something to be said in favour of this. There are, however, dangers. If one function of property is to give a man security, it cannot serve this purpose if the property takes the form of shares in the company in which he works. There is the obvious danger that if things go wrong for the company, he may lose his job and at the same time find the shares he owns are worth little or nothing. If the working man is to acquire an interest in industry, it should be done in one or both of two ways: first, through participation in a pension scheme, the funds of which are likely to be invested in a wide variety of industries; and secondly through the purchase of unit trusts, where again the funds are invested in a wide variety of companies. It is too dangerous to invest all in one enterprise, especially the one for which one works.

This is not to deny that there ought to be more of a partnership between those who provide the labour which is essential to production (including the labour of the managerial class) and those who provide the capital, which is equally essential. This partnership should be based on the open recognition that production needs both labour and capital, and not upon making the workers also capitalists.

---

\* With an annuity, a man is paid a fixed sum each year, part of which represents a return of a proportion of the purchase price of the annuity and part of which represents interest on the proportion remaining invested. The price of an annuity is fixed so that at the end of the average expectation of life, the sum remaining is zero. An insurance company offering annuities will deal with large numbers, and will find that it can rely on these conforming to the average expectation of life.

There is no reason why we should think in terms of one kind of arrangement for all industries and all firms. There is nothing inherently wrong in the simple wage contract. Even in this case, one may argue that the rights of the employer ought to be limited. A worker who has proved himself competent should not be subject to arbitrary dismissal. So long as there is work to be done, he should enjoy security in his employment and be subject to dismissal only for sufficient cause. Furthermore, if he becomes redundant, there should be reasonable provision for adequate notice and compensation. One could imagine enterprises where the workers themselves were in full control and received all the profits, paying only a fixed rate of interest on the borrowed capital. The big danger of such a system, from the workers' point of view, would be that their incomes would be subject to marked fluctuation with the state of trade. Finally, one may try to devise systems whereby there is a measure of joint control.

Such systems could include the appointment of workers' representatives to the board of directors. They would have the right to take part in discussion of all aspects of a firm's policy, but would take a special interest in matters of direct importance to the workers.

Systems of joint control would be most appropriate for the large public companies, and would tend to be a counter to the existing concentration of economic power in the hands of big share holders or a managerial clique. Leaving control in the hands of the owner of a business, subject to specific rights being assured to the worker by legislation or collective bargaining, would be appropriate in the case of fairly small enterprises. In middle-sized enterprises, one might allow both systems to exist side by side. Workers' control would be a much more experimental matter and could be tried out where the workers were prepared to shoulder the risks and responsibilities it would involve and where people were prepared to put up the fixed interest capital required, or to convert their present shareholdings into fixed interest loans with perhaps greater security but a reduced rate of return.\*

---

\* The lender is in a more secure position than the shareholder in so far as there is an obligation on the enterprise to pay his interest regularly. In the kind of set-up under consideration, wage-earners might have to accept reduced rates of pay in order to meet interest payments, though there would be a limit below which wages could not be reduced.

**How can any intelligent person be a Catholic and allow all her decisions to be made for her by the Church? Does the Church claim to be the only religion established by God? Would it be a good idea for priests to wear a badge distinguishing them from parsons?**

## Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

**Would it be a good idea for priests to wear a badge distinguishing them from parsons?**

You are out of date. The question that arises from the present situation is: should priests have a uniform or a badge which distinguishes them from laymen?

Some priests have adopted a fashion in dress which distinguishes them from parsons by identifying them with nonconformist adolescents. They seem to think that *aggiornamento* for the Catholic clergy means suppressing any difference between themselves and the laity — no dark suits, no roman collars, no title of "Father", but, instead, jeans and jerseys and "Call me Joe". The practice, however well-meaning, is not likely to help their apostolate, as it is apparently regretted by most of the laity, adolescents included; and it prejudices more thoughtful efforts at understanding between clergy and laity.

To generalize on the subject would be rash, seeing the variety of practice in different countries, and the willingness of the authorities to tolerate experiments. My own opinion is that an ecclesiastical or religious profession should normally be professed in appearance, as well as in heart and mind. Men and women in religious dress are making a public act of allegiance, which could be profitable to the witnesses. Besides, as they have truth, in words or actions, to give on demand, they should be recognizable. They should also be approachable. Their dress therefore should be both a sign and a welcome. It is to make the welcome more

visible while keeping the sign that some priests on the European continent wear a darkish suit, and a dark shirt with a dark tie. They have abandoned what is thought to be the forbiddingness of black unrelieved except by a roman collar. It is for them to judge if the style serves its purpose.

Secular institutes, anticipated four hundred years ago by St. Angela Merici, and the Filles de Marie, a religious congregation established during the French Revolution by Fr. de Clorivière, for their own good purposes do not have a uniform at all.

**My father died before I was born. Shall I be able to recognize him in heaven?**

Yes. I don't know in how many ways you will recognize him, and he you; but you will all of a sudden be present to one another by an irresistible attraction. That is because your histories are inseparable, and you belong together.

The qualification for membership of the family of God is love, which is a bond of a special kind, not external but made by a sharing of life and an intertwining of personalities. It exists in this life, and it is indestructible because it is our participation in the life of God. You know how people can be bound by sympathy, understanding, concern for and dedication to one another. What may seem here to be merely attitudes, unknowable except through words and actions, are forces which in heaven will be immediately perceptible without the mediation of the senses

The relationship of love will operate in eternity, as it does in time, realistically. It will be above all a direction of self to God; then, as human beings have their own kind of reality, it will be the gift of self to people that takes account of permanent facts such as ties of blood and friendship — the details of personal salvation — histories made together.

All that being true, you can see how there will be no anonymity of bodily appearance. Each soul makes the body which is its partner in human nature, and the features will be a mirror of personality and of all that has gone into the building of a Christian perfection. It will be apparent — not just to you but to everyone — from some particular goodness in this particular Christian — that

he is your father; and you and all will be filled with happiness at the sight. You will have no need of an introduction.

**If someone receives a kidney from a donor, whose will it be in the resurrection of the body?**

We ought to begin by asking whose kidney it is here and now. It is not the donor's once the first operation is finished: he no longer gives it life; but after the operation of grafting has been done there is no certainty that the recipient will be able to give life to the kidney. If he overcomes all kinds of reluctances in the body to accept a graft, and manages to enliven the kidney, then it is his: but a dead kidney belongs to nobody.

Perhaps you have an over-simplified notion of bodily resurrection, something like pictures that show fully constituted human bodies rising from tombs. The idea would be that all matter is conserved, and no particle of it is annihilated; so, when our bodies are to be resurrected, the divine power collects every single particle of what was our body, puts all the bits together into our shape, and lets our soul into it. The power of God could do even that; but there are good reasons for rejecting that explanation. There are some reasons more captious than serious, as that, in the ordinary wear and tear of life, we have used far more particles of matter than are needed for making one body, or that, as is gruesomely related in the poem "Oe'r Ilkla Moor baht 'at" and stated in the surgical terms of your question, some bits of matter have, at different times, been integral parts of different human bodies. The decisive reason, however, for rejecting the difficulty you raise as imaginary is that it is the soul which, under the power of God, resurrects its own body. The soul is both architect and builder of the body in this life, putting a vital force into matter so that it can multiply itself according to plan. What the soul does now it can do again, using any particle of its original body.

**The Pope can't make doctrinal decisions without union with the whole Church. He believes what the Church believes; he teaches what the Church teaches; and he can speak only as representative of the whole Church. Isn't it therefore necessary to have unlimited discussion in the Church so that the truth may appear?**

One truth that needs to appear is the constitution of the Church

as made by Christ. There is more of obscurity than enlightenment in your question. It is true that faith is God's gift to the whole Church, and that the Holy Spirit is at work in the whole Church and in every member who does not shut Him out; but you have so framed your question as to suggest that the Pope can know and unfold Christ's revelation only when the whole Church informs him what it is and what it means.

You will find in the Constitution *Lumen Genitum* of the recent Council a declaration that the entire body of the faithful cannot err in matters of belief because of the indwelling of the Spirit of Truth. The whole Church is infallible. The infallibility is not passive but active, in the activity of living its faith; but it is not a teaching infallibility. The Council goes on to say that the inerrancy of the body of the faithful is exercised under the guidance of the sacred teaching authority, and that is given exclusively to the Pope and the whole body of bishops.

There is a certain naivety in your trust in "unlimited discussion" as a revealer of truth. It is the Holy Spirit who reveals truth, and we open our minds to his "blessed light" by prayer — the prayer of the blind. Certainly there should be full intercommunication in the Church, and a sharing of what the Council calls "charisms"—special graces—given by the Spirit to the faithful of every rank; but a flow of words is not necessarily the communication of truth. St. Paul says: Let no evil speech proceed from your mouth, but that which is good, to the building up of faith, that you may administer grace to the hearers.

### **Does the Church claim to be the only religion established by God?**

All goodness comes from God. All honest worship of Him is in his power. Anyone who loves God is enabled to do so by God Himself. But "establishment"? According to what the Church accepts as divine revelation, the salvation of mankind has been accomplished in human history by God's favour to one people chosen to prepare for the coming of the Son of God by cleaving to God under a covenant and so leading to the presence in the human race of God-made-man who founded one Church. Christ established Christianity. It cannot be said that he established any

other religion — unless the word “establish” is made to bear two quite different meanings.

The Decree on Ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council says that the Church is God's only flock; but the Church works as Christ did so that there may be one fold and one shepherd. It is doing a disservice to Christ to say that any religion is the right sheepfold. That is not true. Neither is it true to say that other religions than Christianity shelter only goats, or that the sheep within them have wilfully strayed, or that they will starve to death. Christ is their shepherd, though they may not know and follow Him, and He can save them. But the way He wanted them to be saved was in His Church, and we should want that too.

God leaves man a large part of the making of human history. Much of man's making is malicious or erroneous, but God can get good out of it. He can get good out of any human activity — politics, economics, and certainly religion in which there is so much good will.

**How can any intelligent person be a Catholic and allow all her decisions to be made for her by the Church?**

She can't, can she? She has to use her intelligence to find out which decisions are her business (and those she should make), and which belong to the Church (and she leaves the Church to make them).

The setting up of limits to the exercise of authority is necessary for the order in the world, where there are so many different authorities covering the same ground and the same people. Any commercial firm, or institute of education, or national government, or local council, or family — any human society at all — has to decide just what is the area in which officials or heads or managers are authorized to give orders. Conflict or confusion must be prevented for the common good.

The extent of the Church's authority must also be determined: it is not unlimited. There will never be a permanent and wholly satisfying settlement of the dispute between Church and State about their authority over the same people. What of the Church's claim to bind consciences? Can there be an acceptable solution of the state of war between the Church's authority over conscience and the conscience's autonomy? There can. The Church's teaching

and the Catholic's conscience should never be on collision courses—they are meant to go in the same direction.

A conscience which thinks itself competent to point infallibly to truth is already wrong: no conscience is that good. Find out what truths have been committed by Christ to the Church — find out what pronouncements of the teaching Church are guaranteed infallible by Christ — and you already have a sure direction for conscience, and a firm possession of truth. Conscience does not make truth, but if it is sound and healthy it can find truth. Goodness and soundness are partly from nature, partly from right upbringing, and partly from the inspiration of the Holy Spirit—which do not contradict one another.

---

## *'Deplorably Obscure'*

You may have read of the case of Mr. Cable. For those who did not, a very brief statement of it may be enlightening. Mr. Cable in March, 1962, had a molten metal crucible burst in his face, and as a result his face, eyes, neck and arms were burnt. In the December his left eye had to be removed. He could see well enough with his right, but in July, 1963 the sight of that eye began to fail him because of a disease contracted after the accident. It had nothing to do with his employment. But in consequence of the accident he was made almost blind.

On August 21, 1964, the case went before the Medical Appeal Tribunal to assess how much disablement benefit he was entitled to. What follows has a Dickensian flavour: "The question was: How was his disablement benefit to be assessed? Was he only entitled to benefit in respect of his lost left eye taken alone? Or was the disease in his right eye, which happened subsequently, to be taken into account so as to increase his benefit? The tribunal held that the left eye alone qualified for benefit, and assessed the disablement at 40 per cent for life. On his appeal to the Industrial Injuries Tribunal, the majority affirmed the award at 40 per cent. But the Commissioner, Sir Robert Micklethwaite, dissented. He thought that regard could be had to the right eye so as to give Mr. Cable somewhat more than 40 per cent." The Divisional Court upheld the majority.

### *Scheduled Percentage*

Mr. Cable will be comforted to know that many of the "statutory requirements were obviously satisfied". When the metal crucible exploded in his face there was an "accident". He suffered thereby a "personal injury" by accident arising out of and in the course of his employment. As a consequence he suffered from "loss of faculty"; and as a result of that loss of faculty he incurred a "disability" in that he could only see out of one eye. So long as he retained the use of that eye his resulting disablement was to be assessed at the scheduled percentage, 40 per cent, for the loss of one eye, without complications, the other eye being normal, under regulation 2 (2) and Schedule 2 thereunder.

And so it went on interminably with the almost blind Mr. Cable waiting patiently while their Lordships sorted out the schedules and regulations which govern the law. In the end the case came precisely within regulation 2(3) (a). "The tribunal ought to have assessed the loss of faculty at 40 per cent and adjusted it upwards to such extent as was reasonable in the circumstances, having regard to his greater disabilities at the date of the assessment."

This is an example of how a "developed" nation deals out justice to its injured workers. And then its spokesmen wonder at the widespread cynicism and apathy! *The Times*, (Nov. 15) began its account of the case in these words: "The statutory provisions relating to claims for industrial injuries benefit are so deplorably obscure, even for the judges who have to construe them, that it is impossible for an injured workman or his trade union representatives or advisers to form any reliable view on his rights under the Acts and the regulations, or for the medical men and civil servants who have to make awards to know what some of them mean." If the halt and the maimed have to be defrauded, it is perhaps as well that the law is hidden in an impenetrable fog of words. It is often said that hard cases make bad laws. It would seem rather that unjust laws make hard cases. And the sooner they are amended the better.

---

## THE CHURCH AT WORK

The presentation of the faith in everyday language was the first major victory in the drafting of the *Dogmatic Constitution of the Church*. Using this language the document lays down the role of the laity and of the bishops and the Pope. A distinction of great importance established by the Council is that the People of God *as a whole* comes directly under the authority of the Pope, that which concerns the diocese or the region comes under the bishop or the regional hierarchy. In the last chapter on the Blessed Virgin nothing new is added, and nothing old is left out.

# Vatican Council II

## II. DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION ON THE CHURCH

### OBSERVER

WHEN the Fathers of the Council first met in October, 1962, they were presented with a schema under the title of the *Dogmatic Constitution of the Church*. For the first time in the history of Oecumenical Assemblies, there was to be presented to the world an authoritative document with the full weight of a Council behind it, giving an outline of the Church's teaching on the inheritance it had received from Christ. It was to contain no newly defined doctrine but only a summary, in consecutive and easily readable form, of the formal teaching of past Councils and the universally accepted statements of the theologians. There was a fundamental reason for this apparent break with tradition. The time was now opportune for an approach in charity to be made on a world-wide scale to those who had a partially or completely false notion of what the Church of Rome is and teaches. The long period of sniping, of cold war and armed peace, had to be brought to a close. With the various Protestant bodies in the West and the

Orthodox churches of the East, disunity among Christians was at last and in a sense "happily" to be accepted as a fact; "happily" because of a sincere and formal recognition that those outside the boundaries of Rome were not there because of ill-will, nor motivated by a wish to deny the whole Christ. Moreover, there was a further recognition that the neo-pagans of the formally Christian nations, and themselves the descendants of baptised believers, were — many of them — men of good will who did not know where to turn in their search for an answer to their fundamental problems. It seemed therefore only right and just that the first work of the Council should be to formulate the teaching of the Church in a simple summary that it might be understood by all.

### *The Fathers Reject the Schema*

Drawn up by the preparatory Commission over a period of two years and appearing to them to be just what the Pope had ordered, the original schema became one of the most roughly handled and most completely transformed of all the preparatory drafts. The bishops would have none of it — and we can be sure that Pope John, shut up in his rooms in the Vatican and receiving hourly reports of the events in the Basilica, heartily concurred, though he was never to see the final draft.

The Commission and the Curia should have been warned by the reception that the Fathers of the First Vatican gave to a like draft on the Church in 1869. The fathers of 1962 gave theirs short shrift, despite the efforts of the curial members to defend and have accepted that which was primarily their offspring. It was not that the Fathers disagreed with the substance of the draft or considered any of it heterodox, but they did violently condemn its form: it was the work of the schoolmen with their subtle distinction, an apologetic stress on the dogma set in a framework of the institutionalism of the Church; only erudite theologians would have the patience and courage to read it to the end. What the bishops wanted and finally won, but only after a two years' contest, a flood of amendments and a thorough re-draft, was a presentation of the faith in everyday language, palatable to the ordinary Catholic and at least comprehensible to the normal non-Catholic, whether Christian or not. The result was worth all the effort. On November 21st, 1964, the final Constitution was passed in the Assembly by

a majority of 2,151 to five. Could there have been anything more unanimous? Any greater testimony to Pope John's insistence that the Council had to be, above all, pastoral?

### *The People of God*

Officially entitled *Lumen Gentium* — the Light of Nations — from its opening words, the Constitution stresses that the Church is made up of the People of God, a phrase that is constantly used here and in later documents. The Church is not first and foremost an "institution". The institution is there — the hierarchy, the authority, the laws, direction and obedience — for there can be no human unity, even in Christ, without these, and Christ it was who outlined its framework. But that which is the Church is the People of God — the baptised, the infused with grace, the tempted, the fallen, the forgiven. The institution is the *means* created by God for the sanctification of His People. Hence it is for the People to sanctify themselves and to try and draw all other men to Christ that they also may be sanctified in the full doing of God's will. For our sanctification Christ has given us the Sacraments and above all the Mass. In later documents, the bishops will analyse the means to sanctification more fully, but here they are fitted into the general framework of the Church.

Except by implication, the Constitution does not look over its shoulder into the past. It is a summons to the People (and at all times the bishops include themselves in the phrase, for they are but part of the People of God), to look to the future and to the glorious opportunities that the future holds for the spread of the knowledge of Christ. With regard to the "new Order in the world, a sentence is used that is a reminder of Pope John's encyclical *Mater et Magistra* in its use of the expression that in translation led to so much confusion on its first publication, namely "socialization". The Constitution spells out its true meaning once again when it says: "The conditions of this age lend special urgency to the Church's task of bringing all men to union with Christ, since mankind today is joined together more closely than ever before by social, technical and cultural bonds". Unfortunately, having indicated so early on in the Council's proceedings, the vital importance of this close and yet diverse bond, the Fathers failed, owing to pressure of time, to take the opportunity to expatiate on the subject when they came to the document on *Communications*.

### "The People Cannot Err"

With the abolition of censorship within the Church and following on the Council's document on Religious Freedom, there is the danger that some Catholics may endeavour to assume to themselves the right of private interpretation of the Word of God. Wrested from its context, there is a particular phrase that might give them a handle. "The body of the faithful as a whole," says the Constitution on the Church, "anointed as they are by the Holy Spirit, cannot err in matters of belief. Thanks to the supernatural sense of the faith which characterises the People as a whole, it manifests this unerring quality. . . ." but, the document continues, ". . . when from the bishops down to the last member of the laity, it shows universal agreement in matters of faith and morals". In other words, no more than at the time of the Reformation, when more than half the Church withdrew its allegiance from the See of Peter, is the faith to be judged by the counting of heads. The key exponents of the faith and its guardians must remain the bishops in union with their head, the Pope. The vocal laity, the writers and journalists, the film and T.V. stars, the local fanatic, are no more given a mandate to "discover" and proclaim new doctrines of the Church than is any other private individual, not even an individual bishop.

But this does not mean that the laity (or for that matter the ordinary priest) have nothing to contribute. Here for the first time in a Council document, there is spelled out the fact, only held implicitly in the past and often only honoured in the breach, that the laity have an integral part to play in the unity which is the People of God. Their particular sphere is more fully categorised in the *Pastoral Constitution of the Church* and in the decree on *The Apostolate of the Laity*. Here it is, however, stressed that "the layman has a secular quality proper and special to his lay status" and hence an obligation under God to work for the sanctification of the world from within. Nor must the laity think of themselves as "in all things subject to and dependent on their priests". The secular fields and material progress, viewed by the Fathers as part of God's design, are their particular sphere. They are also urged to distinguish between their rights and duties as members of the Church and those they enjoy as members of society, for the secular field is governed by its own principles. The Fathers do not specify the distinction between the two fields, but

obviously they cannot be contradictory for both are above all governed by the search for truth. But what it does imply is that the scientist—economist, archaeologist, physicist, etc.—has nothing to fear from the teaching of the Church.

Furthermore, the individual layman who is competent in a particular subject, has even the duty to express and press his opinion, to priest and bishop on any matter that concerns the Church. The clergy, bishop and priest, as a complement, have the duty to seek the layman's advice and give it due respect. Once again it must be repeated that this interdependence of clergy and laity is not a question of expedience or a mere sop to the desire on the part of the laity to be vocal, but is integral to the very meaning of the Church as the People of God. The very health, the very essence of the Church depends on all — Pope, bishops, priests and laity — recognising themselves as being one in Christ, differing members of the Body of Christ, with differing functions, but the eye cannot say to the ear "I have no need of thee".

### *The College of Bishops*

In the chapter devoted to the hierarchial structure of the Church, the Council takes up the work begun but left unfinished by the previous Council of the Vatican. The definition on "Papal Infallibility" was never intended to be the whole or even the main task of the Fathers in 1870. Nor indeed did the question on the Pope's authority arise until after the Council had assembled and a spate of petitions poured in to the Commissions from various of the Fathers themselves. Because their work remained unfinished owing to the clamour of the Piedmontese at the gates of the city, it has often been assumed that as a result of that sole definition, the Pope alone assumed a firm position in the Church and the bishops became his mere auxiliaries. The Second Council, after recalling the dogma of 1870, goes on to complete the work on the hierarchy's authority. By the very reception of his orders( which incidentally are defined as being superior in *essence* to those of the ordinary priest, again for the first time by any Council), the bishop receives his authority—in the image of Christ as Priest, Prophet and King—from Christ Himself. But his powers may be exercised only in union with the College of Bishops itself, which is, and must be, headed by the Pope.

Despite the collective infallibility which the bishops possess, the

Pope is not reduced to a *primus inter pares*. Not only does he (of course) retain the infallibility decreed in 1870, but he holds ordinary authority over the whole People of God. A bishop has ordinary authority only over his own diocese and that at the discretion of the Pope, whether implicitly or explicitly given.

The care of the whole flock was entrusted to St. Peter and it is declared that it still depends on the Pope to determine, according to the changing needs of the times, the way in which it is fitting for this care to be exercised, whether personally or collegially. Hence when it came to the question of setting up the College as a physical and active reality, its constitution was not decided in the Council, but was issued in a *motu proprio* by Paul VI in September 1965. Likewise the changes in the curial congregations lately published, were not the work of the Council, but of the Pope himself. These two recent changes in the active powers of the diocesan bishops — the summoning of the Synod and their presence in the curia — may be among the biggest forces for good that have come out of the Council; nevertheless their establishment has depended on the ordinary power of the Pope. The distinction established by the Council is of paramount importance: that which concerns the People of God AS A WHOLE comes directly under the authority of the Pope; that which concerns the diocese or the region comes under the bishop or the regional hierarchy. Although no mention of the fact is made in the Council documents, perhaps it is well for us to remind ourselves that many of the prerogatives exercised by the Pope, came to him, not because he was the successor of St. Peter as such, but because he was also Primate of the West. That primacy as Patriarch, with the "expansion" of the West throughout the world, is losing its relevance.

### *The Blessed Virgin*

The final chapter is devoted to the subject of the Blessed Virgin. It tells us nothing new and omits nothing old and is an admirable summary of the reasons why the Church cultivates devotion to the Mother of God. But does warn against any cult that is excessive or has no solid basis in traditional teaching and theology, which may be a scandal to our separated brethren. It contains finally a passage which may be applied to other parts of sacred theology, giving theologians a brief for further research and implying that as the Church is a "Mystery", that is, something surpassing the full

comprehension of man, so there will always be work for man to try and penetrate more deeply into its meaning — man will never fully understand all that it contains and teaches.

With the vast majority of us still having to do the will of God through the submission of our wills to the will of our fellow-men, the words of St. Augustine, quoted by the Constitution may be found an encouragement:

“What I am *for* you terrifies me: what I am *with* you consoles me. *For* you I am a bishop; but *with* you I am a Christian. The former is a title of duty; the latter one of grace. The former is a danger; the latter, salvation”.

---

### A CHRISTMAS GIFT

If you are wondering what to give a serious-minded friend at Christmas time, why not take out a subscription for Christian Order? You enjoy it; why not let her share your enjoyment? Write to Christian Order c/o C. J. FALLON LTD., Parkgate Street, Dublin 8, Ireland and enclose £1.

# Book Reviews

## PEACE ON EARTH

**Francis of Assisi** by A. M. Almedigen; Bodley Head, 25s; pp. 191. **He Who Rides the Tiger** by Luis Taruc; Chapman, 25s; pp. 188. **The Kingdom of this World** by Alejo Carpentier; Gollancz, 18s; pp. 1500.

**L**UIS TARUC had this in common with the little man of Assisi, that he sought to bring joy to his world. It needed it. Like that of St. Francis, it was and still is marred by great disparities of wealth between rich and poor. In the Philippines, only ten per cent of the land is owned by the peasants who work it. The rest is in the hands of a rich landlord class and the life of those they employ is a miserable one.

It was this that Taruc sought to change. He longer to free his people — the poor — from oppression, to bring joy into their lives. It was for this reason that he took arms against those who oppressed them. So far as he could see, there was no other way. His vision was of a peasant paradise where men would live as brothers. This was the dream for which he fought. He was never, I think, an ideologue. But, to bring reality to his dream, he joined forces with those who were. This was his mistake. Taruc's Communist Allies sought power, not joy. Victory, for them, could mean only the replacement of one tyranny with another. Taruc sensed this whilst he fought at their side. In the end, I imagine, it was the major factor that prompted his surrender. After fourteen years as a guerilla, the moment came when he realised that a communist victory could mean in the end only further oppression. At that point, he laid down his arms.

Saint Francis had no thought of social reform. He sought only to follow Christ, who had himself been poor. Therefore, Francis gave away what he had and made himself poor for Christ's sake that he might come closer to Christ himself. It was as simple as that. His way was the way of the counsels, of evangelical poverty. It cannot be the way for all men. The great majority need substance to their lives of the sort that Francis took no thought of. Sufficiency, for them, is a condition of joy. It is this that

Taruc understood. But sufficiency of itself is not enough. There has to be single-mindedness, a relating of things to God of the kind that brings appreciation and, with it, gladness of heart. This is the lesson of the little man of Assisi for all men at all times. He was content with nothing in order that we might learn to appreciate the little or more that we may have. Material goods are essentially a means. Once they are taken from their context and sought for themselves, social reform becomes meaningless, an instrument which brings no joy, but serves only to transfer resources — and, therefore, power — within a community, and father new oppressions. This is the lesson of the slave revolts in Haiti, told with the richest blend of colour and pathos by Alejo Carpentier in his *Kingdom of this World*. It is the story of some countries today in the developing world. One thinks of the Congo; of Nkrumah's Ghana. Independence has meant, not freedom for the people; only the transfer of power to new oppressors. These revolutions have eaten their children.

And not only in today's developing world, not only where violence is used. I never cease to wonder at the Englishman who looks on so condescendingly whilst Afro-Asians engage in internecine struggle for the fruits of new-found independence. Behind his stance is the implication that we ourselves are without taint. Like the Pharisee, he thanks God that he is not like other men. Violence, long since, has been put behind the English as an instrument of social change. Our way forward is through evolution within a democratic framework which it has taken us years to build into our bones. The developing countries are still young. They have sought to come of age before their time. Violence, meanwhile, must be their lot. So runs the argument of the complacent Englishman as he surveys, with a certain satisfaction, the deteriorating scene in some developing countries.

His argument is wrong, if only for the reason that the peaceful evolution he boasts of may well enshrine false values, paying increasing court to the kind of permissive morality which plagues so large a sector of English life today. We need to take a long cool look at ourselves before striking so condescending an attitude in face of the factional fighting that mars so unhappily the present evolutionary stage of some developing societies. This is not to condone violence or to assert that the end justifies the means, but simply to remind the reader of something often forgotten, that true

social progress is unattainable apart from Christian values. To be capable of it, nations must realise with Leo the Great that perfect freedom is found only in God's service and that a national life which takes His values into account constitutes the only basis of valid social reform. This is the message of Saint Francis for the world of today and tomorrow. Luis Taruc grasped it in the end. Having done so, he saw that he had to part company with his Communist Allies — because what they want is power, not valid social reform.

I have written of Taruc in the past tense. This is a mistake in a way for, at the moment of writing, he is still in a Philippine gaol. There, thanks to his good friend Douglas Hyde amongst others, he found once again the Faith of his Fathers, which I feel personally he never really lost. In this sense, he was born again. He regained life in Christ. There is a moving passage, in this altogether moving book, in which the former leader of the Huk guerillas — brave men, so many of them, fighting for justice — describes his feelings as he knelt, once again, after so many years, at Midnight Mass in prison:

“As I knelt, I felt as though I were surrounded with love and tenderness. It was like the first meeting with my mother after my surrender, when she embraced me and wept on my shoulder. I felt the Church embracing me in the same way at midnight Mass. And like my mother, the Church received me without reproach, with nothing but love. I felt I had come home.”

It is my hope and prayer as I write these lines that, by the time they are published, Luis Taruc will once more be at liberty, working with passion and courage and with the blessing of a Church that failed him and his people in the past, for justice and freedom. Meanwhile, apart from the message implicit in his book and proclaimed positively and with great beauty in its twelfth chapter—that love, not hate, must be the driving force behind all we strive for on behalf of our fellow-men — there is a warning of which we do well to take careful note. Simply put, it comes to this — Christianity and Communism are incompatible.

In this context, there are two passages from Taruc's book that need to be quoted. They need to be read as the words of a man who for fourteen years shared the life of a guerilla with Communist Allies. During this time, Luis Taruc, a great leader of men in his own right, came to know what Communism stood for, not academically, but with every fibre of his being. For this very reason —

because his assent to the evil of Communism is real in Newman's sense, not notional — his verdict on it, fourteen years in the making, deserves the considered and close attention of all men of good will, not least of Catholic intellectuals engaged at present in dialogue with their opposite numbers in the Communist Party. The passages from Taruc's book are long. I feel it essential that they be quoted in full. The first is on pages 154 and 155:

"To the genuine Bolshevik, there is no such thing as an individually good or bad man. A Communist is only a good or bad member of his class. An act is good if it serves the interests of the working class and is bad if it is harmful to the interests of that class. Such standards open up terrifying possibilities as to how far this principle can be applied. It is no wonder that fascists and Communists eventually met on common ground. Democracy and freedom can never be realized under Communism. Those great sources of the revolutionary's strength and hope—love, friendship, and comradeship—eventually disappear under a Communist regime. It has been my lot to experience this. Even though my once cherished comrades had never truly tasted the fruits of power, they acted towards me, and towards many others like little Stalins. The irony of it is that I often helped them attain their positions of power within the Party by supporting them and refusing such positions for myself. Once they were entrenched it was my head that rolled first.

"From 1938 on, I was one of the small group of top leaders who composed the Politburo of the merged Socialist and Communist parties. This was the Party's highest executive apparatus. But, because of my idealism and loyalty to the Party, I had to experience shocking manifestations of evil, ruthlessly resorted to by the Party leadership, before I could be jolted into decisive action.

"Within the Party, fear, in the guise of discipline, is the binding force by which order is maintained. The rank and file's fighting spirit is maintained by hate, not compassionate anger tempered with love".

The second is on pages 168-170:

"In the Communist Party, I learned the doctrine that only the working class comprises humanity. The 'class enemy' has no right to exist; it must be 'liquidated'. There was no distinction between good and bad elements in society; only the working class, the 'proletariat' is good. The 'bourgeoisie' is bad. Only the Communist Party can lead the proletariat to victory, and only through dictatorship of the proletariat can the present dictatorship of the bourgeoisie be ended. Therefore, only the international Communist movement can really liberate humanity.

"The logic was sweeping and clear-cut, and I was swept along with it. It seemed plausible. But theories must be tested in action, and in practice. I found the Bolshevik logic seriously wanting. The

human element in society simply cannot be mechanically explained in terms of mass thinking, mass action, and mass decisions. Order, planning, and co-ordination must take account of the individual, the human person who is the key participant. He must be the determining factor.

"Even though the Bolsheviks call their form of organization 'democratic centralism', it holds no democracy. Without the people's participation on a wide scale in the conduct of their social, economic and political affairs, democracy is a farce. And without democracy, all talk of freedom, humanism, and humanity is an insult to every self-respecting citizen.

"Of all revolutionary movements, the Communist movement is the most flexible when it wants to be. We must therefore expect that in the Philippines the Party is doing everything in its power to correct its mistakes, adopt new policies, evolve new tactics and new forms of organization, all in conformity with the demands of the new situation. The Party is ever alert and ready for new developments. But above all considerations, it must be remembered that the Communist movement will never give up its basic and fundamental aim or depart from its long-term strategy, which is to communize the world. It will not stop short of that goal. All its tactics must serve that over-all strategy. When Communists join harmless fraternities or even religious bodies, these are tactics and nothing more.

"I joined the revolutionary movement seeking the right means to secure justice for the oppressed. Instead, I learned through painful experience that the Communist Party is founded on principles that lead to great injustices. I was seeking for a way to fight the centuries-old oppression and exploitation of the poor. But I found in the Communist Party systematic oppression and exploitation, not only of the physical self of the individual but of his most sacred thoughts and emotions. All this is done in the name of 'liberation'."

These are the conclusions Taruc came to during the period from 1948-1952 when he was forced to consider the evidence presented to his senses by the evil of his Communist Allies. Till then he had forced it from his mind in an endeavour to preserve the unity of his followers. Now, he found he could do so no longer. He began to recover his belief in God, which I myself think he never really lost: "In the peace and quiet I found under the giant trees in the heart of the Sierra Madre mountains, I felt the presence of God, I knew that I was in the presence of a Supreme Intelligence and Power". And he realised with horror what Communism had been doing to him. More telling, even, than his verdict on Communism are the words in which he realizes with horror what it had nearly done to himself: "I came into the liberation movement

with a fervent love of God; I nearly became a bitter atheist during my association with the Communists. I came with a burning love of my country and our people; I nearly became a man without country, a traitor to my native land and nation. I nearly became a fanatical agent of Bolshevik Communism, worshipping as home land and fountainhead of cherished aspirations not my own country but the Soviet Union. I nearly became a robot whose only loyalty was toward the Communist Party, which in turn is loyal only to the international Communist movement, which in its turn controlled by the Kremlin ”.

So, in the summer of 1954, Luis Taruc, leader of the Huk, came down from the hills and gave himself up.

Written in gaol, where he now serves a life sentence, Taruc's book tells the story of one who, deep down in his heart, shares more with the little man of Assisi than perhaps he will ever know. I beg all who can to read it. Having done so, I would ask them also to pray with me that his release from prison will not be long delayed. Taruc's country needs him now more than ever before. So, too, does his Church. If the two will let him have his head, then work with him as they should, peace, which is the fruit of justice, and, with peace, joy, will come, I believe, to his countrymen.

I have titled this article "Peace on Earth". The lesson of Taruc and of Francis is simply that which the Angels sang to the shepherds on the night that Christ was born. It is that peace can come only to men of good will.

Paul Crane, S.J.